

LAWRENCE GREATRAKE'S

CALUMNIES REPELL'D.

BY ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

"A false witness shall not be unpunished; and he that speaketh
lies shall perish."

"So they hanged Haman on the gallows that he had prepared
for Mordecai." *The Bible.*

"MAGNIS TAMEN EXCIDIT AUSIS."

—BUFFALOE—
BROOKE COUNTY, VA.

PUBLISHED BY A. CAMPBELL.

Price 12½ Cents.

.....
1835.

111

4 Mr 1953

D153
C1876

CALUMNIES REPELL'D, &c.

CHAPTER I.

THE following Letter is made up entirely from Mr. Greatrake's second pamphlet, with the exception of the words enclosed in brackets. It speaks for itself; and, alas! too fully exhibits to what lengths a clergyman may be driven, in his efforts to destroy the influence of one whom his own views and imagination have rendered obnoxious to his displeasure. I wish it to be distinctly remembered, that this man commenced hostilities against me, without any other provocation than his own views of my writings, and their supposed influence in defeating his own schemes and opinions. He must either have found, or supposed himself to be, one of those actors in the kingdom of the clergy, against whose influence my writings are intended to operate. He defends the common cause of the priesthood without a special call; and not the potency of his efforts, but their singularity, makes it my special duty to take this notice of them.

"TO ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

"SIR—The God that separated me from my mother's womb, and gave my soul the second birth—has led me to give evidences of sincerity and honesty—as a professed Baptist, which you never dreamed of. I must hope, and believe now, that God in his providence has—cast my lot in this part of the country to the end that I may in some little degree, check the sluices of soul destroying sentiments which you are opening upon his church. I hate with perfect abhorrence many of your sentiments, I deprecate your influence, in the church of Christ, as one of the greatest curses that can befall her. You have exhibited much of the venom of the serpent. Your reputation is hair-hung. I shall be able, single handed, to make a breach therein, which you will never be able to repair. Every moral unregenerated man has it. [an extrinsic and intrinsic character.] he is a whited sepulchre without, but within, full

Dorsetshire Memorial Library, Exeter

of all uncleanness. Many Socinians have an excellent *extrinsic* character.—Your ignorance of essential, vital, living faith.—Your characteristic ignorance of spiritual things.—You whine and complain.—Your contemptible and puerile attempts.—Your croaking about injustice.—Had you ever been taught in the school of Christ—You have no spiritual perception.—Your heterodoxy and unregeneracy.—You are no Baptist nor Baptist minister—Pen doughty man, what madness possessed you!!—Your metaphysical cunning, a cunning corresponding with the Jesuitical bent of your intellect—That gather round you as crows gather round carrion.—An expression of the malevolence of your heart.—See if some few drops of her blood [Mr. C's church in Pittsburgh] does not rest on you, in judgment as her murderer.—I will turn up a fold of your mantle on which will be disclosed a clot of her blood. If you were not a mere swallow in the knowledge of human life.—I was prepared to understand your character, Sir, as a theologian, at a bird's eye glance. There are some of my friends, who feel pained at the idea of my being added to the list of your victims, and sent round the country in your 'Christian Baptist' as food for vultures. Your disposition to swell. The author of the Alcoran, and you appear to have been exactly the same period of time in seclusion ----The fruits of your retirement have not been so far, one jot, better than his. Beware of Mr. C's Bible studying, it is but a prelude to his hanging, shooting, piking, or cutting in pieces every body's reputation, but his adherents. O! shame where is thy blush!----Your appearance is affectingly similar to that of the O-rich's running her head into the bushes, and imagining that because that part of her *body* [to wit her *head*] is hid, there is no danger of the rest.---O! what a heaven must that be where such works [as this] are esteemed preparation for! That lullaby pamphlet of Mr. Scott's. Your vision was darkened with the jaundice of malevolence. Your occasional contractions, of the moral thorax, in which a guat strains and threatens to choak you. The Reply of your bell-wether Mr. Scott. You are a very tiger at denial, assertion, and haughty invective. Your ill-disguised and consummate vanity.—The Devil de-

sires to be adorned by thee. You betray your own miserable delusions in supposing that baptism is the washing of regeneration. This feature of your awful ignorance of the Gospel—the man who can talk about baptism, as the washing of regeneration, is blind indeed. Publish yourself as no regular Baptist or I will do it for you. I have clearly proved you guilty of slander, and falsehood against me as an hired minister. You are a compound of meanness, selfishness and vanity. Your sordid artifice. No body could deny, but that he was *Godward*, nation clever, though *manward*, he was, to be sure, somewhat *tristical*. I have exhibited the moral complexion of eight small pages of your writing. By hypocrisy, prevarication, direct falsehood, railing, sophistication, and ribaldry, are you indebted for your momentary triumphs over an antagonist. You are—a demi-cuiverin of controversy. You turn out to be a mere Tom Thumb swaggering your way to distinction. But take care you do not find yourself ere long, in the folds of the Anaconda, and while writhing in agony, be literally crushed in its folds. I would advise Mr. Scott to make himself familiar with the physiognomy of a very prominent figure in West's celebrated picture of the *breaking of bread*, to the end that he may learn to be cautious, in laying claim to any thing of the sincere or amiable Mr Church—a fly in amber—a beetle surveying the pass of Thermopylae. To go over the first part of your review has been as tedious as to follow an ox cart through a Virginia sand flat. I now leave you to the keen vibrations of the preceding truth. You heaven-born souls, agonize for the kingdom of Christ to come! He must be entirely ignorant of the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ in his own heart. It is a mark—that he knows—not even the first principles of the Gospel. His calling Pentecost the regeneration. Can you want greater evidence of Mr C's heterodoxy, of his unregeneracy. J. Priestly nor T. Paine never gave stronger proof of their being natural men than he does. O! where will the chapter of inconsistency end! A Baptist minister allowed to publish, [that the words experimental religion are not in the Bible] what may we look for next?—of bold, and impudent assertions, and barefaced error in the name of the Baptists? Were not

the Devils that entered into the swine, believers of this one fact? Were they not dipped, and in the body too, they ran down into the sea, ergo, they were Christians!! Yes, Mr. C. they were just such believers and Christians as your system makes yourself and your disciples. He has said *baptism is salvation*. Every observing man of the world sees, in too many instances, those who have been *sprinkled*, living in sin—those who have water *poured* upon them, living in more sin than he that was sprinkled—and he also sees, those that have been *dipped* in four feet water, committing more sin than either of the other professors. Mr. C.—a dry bone in Ezekiel's valley—a poor deluded unbeliever. The reveries of Swedenburg, the rationale of Priestly, is not more distant from saving faith than these views of Mr. C. Tell Mr. C. none of these things. Cast not your pearl before this swine. His 8th No.—an awful confirmation of the man's unregeneracy. He has mentally lied. You are an unregenerated man and no Baptist. No, Mr. C. the lie is yours. Without any irreligion every one may make sport of Mr. C's writings. Tell—how you are going to dispose of your own *abortions*, before you offer to midwife for those of others. The burden of my design, in my former letters, was to say, that I believed A. Campbell to be a vain, avaricious, heterodox, unregenerate man, and to pronounce him, without any qualification, to be no Baptist. You will see with what unblushing effrontery he can call—any minister an *hireling*. Mr. C has been capable of such a tissue of misrepresentation, abuse, deception, and falsehood.

“A few comments—will give a faint idea of Thomas Campbell's character. This impudence is characteristic of the man; he is inimical to, and has an inveterate hostility against, prayer. T. Campbell's sermons and A. Campbell's writings are as well matched as any two Jackasses' ears. Query, whether Mr. [T] Campbell lied in the meeting house, or at elder Philips'—or at both? T. Campbell went to the meeting house, [Mr. Philips'] he undertook to instruct them *how* they ought to conduct their meetings. This instance of impudence—had I been a deacon of the church [door keeper] at this time, I would have considered it my duty, to have handed Mr. Campbell out of the pulpit, and out of the house too,

[and kicked him] as an impertinent fellow. By forwardness and impudence of this sort. (by teaching Christians *how to walk*) the Father and the Son succeed in getting their ends accomplished. In writing what I have wrote, I lose my time, have no gain. I must have something to animate me, 'tis *notice*--[TO DESTROY A. CAMPBELL'S INFLUENCE] Searcher of the heart, I refer that to thee.

LAWRENCE GREATRAKE.

" *A word of prayer for A. Campbell* —And is it for such a man to be a leader in Israel? Dread God! what an expression of thine anger to thy church generally. And O! my Baptist brethren, what an unutterable woe to you! Pray that God would take off his *restraining grace* from the man, that he may be known to you in his true character, as Hazael was to the prophet Elisha. 2 Kings viii. 13. Yes, pray to God for this, and that he would take out of the world every Baptist minister, and overthrow every Baptist church, so called, who give any countenance or support to the man: either event would be a great blessing to you; and a great blessing demands great supplication.

L. GREATRAKE

A Regular Baptist Minister."

Such is the tythe of the beauties and pious breathings of this new born soul, scattered over 36 pages. As I have never navigated the Mississippi in a keel boat, nor frequented the oyster market at Cheapside, I cannot enter the lists here. This must pass unanswered, because it is unanswerable, I acknowledge myself defeated—and therefore yield the palm to this *regenerated* Divine. Besides, and above all, the King commands me to render to *no man*, regenerate or unregenerate, railing or railing.

CHAP. II.

To the impartial Public.

* AS this gentleman, whom we shall hereafter call Mr. G. both for the sake of brevity, and to avoid all harsh epithets, has addressed two pamphlets of letters to me,

It should have found myself, in common courtesy, obliged to address him in the epistolary way; but the peculiar character of his style forbids me to address one syllable to him. Notwithstanding I refused to address Mr. G. in my former review, he was so obtrusive and so humble as to write letters to me again. In this age of refinement and common civility, we naturally look for the gentleman amongst all professors of Christianity, even where the Christian is wanting. Where the former is wanting, we seldom expect to find the latter. But as his letters were not written for my individual benefit, but to make an impression on your mind, I think it is no way incompatible to present myself before you, and to request your attention while I submit the following vindication of myself from his accusations. His first effort to gain his own ends was all comprized in *four conjectures and seven ifs*. This he is constrained to admit in his last effort. He has now added to the same conjectures a few charges of falsehood and slander.

He complains grievously of his character having been attacked in my review of his first pamphlet. It was attacked in no other way than as I exposed the imbecility and peculiarity of his assault on me. Indeed the man had acquired no character amongst us, to be attacked. The character he gave himself in his former pamphlet, was all he had to lose—and the sooner he lost that, the better for him. He was a mere bird of passage, hovering on his wings, seeking a spot on which to rest. When his name appeared in my review (perhaps the first time it ever saw the light in printed characters) the people complained of me for having been so severe, as to give an anonymous accuser, the astonishingly expressive and illiberal name of Mr. Greatrake. "Greatrake!" said they—"why did you so characterize the man?" I could scarcely persuade them that I meant no reflections by the term—that it was his real name. The man had, then, neither name nor character among us to attack, and if he had been as prudent as old, he would not have, just on his first appearance, given us a character of himself so unlike to that he left behind him, if he left an amiable one there. Indeed, he tells us, (2d page,) that his character cost him "many a scalding tear and many a rending groan." No wonder, then, that it should be some-

trouble to us, as it has been so much to himself. He feelingly tells us, in the same page, that he "found every body [he left behind him] so busy and officious in nursing the bantling, that I have often and again nearly killed myself in my efforts to extricate it from the tenacity of their *loving embraces*." It seems, then, that his character has always been a great trouble to him, and has nearly occasioned the loss of his life. All this I would not be so impolite as to say I disbelieve; but yet I fear if the "*loving embraces*" of his friends were so tormenting to him, his own cruelty to himself will be much more grievous to be borne. I must, however, think that his two pamphlets render it impossible for me, or any one else, in these regions, to either slander or injure his character. It is so well established, that all the pens and tongues of the West will assail it in vain. But he tells us, page 5th, that "as the spectre said to Brutus, so I say to you, in reference to who I am, that you shall know more about me, if my life be spared, hereafter." I hope he will know more about me too, and something more of human nature in general.

But I have no disposition to trouble the public with any other notices of the man than become necessary in my strictures on his performances. His avowed object is to *make a breach in my character that I will never be able to repair*. Bad enough, indeed! My character must be very vulnerable, if a *stranger*, in two or three months, can make such a deadly breach in it. But the astonishing phenomena of his attack is this, that he has already declared my "*extrinsic character*" to be good. Perhaps, however, it has become *bad* since writing my review on his first pamphlet—yes, indeed, *very bad*, for I have exposed the stupidity of an effort to blast the reputation of a man's *heart* when his moral character is good, by the power of *four conjectures and seven ifs*. But to the last performance—

Charge 1st—"You violated your solemn pledge to Messrs. Eichbaum & Johnson, or rather to me through them, to prosecute me, if my name was given to you; that name was given to you solely upon condition that you would prosecute---and you have not done it." The injustice of this charge will appear from the following facts:--1st. On the supposition that I did give such a

pledge—I have not violated it, unless it could be shewn that a certain time was specified, in which to commence such a prosecution; but this is not so much as plead, by Mr. G. How then can he say I have violated such a pledge, as he knows I have been from home ever since, till within a few days? It is time enough yet to prosecute.

But, in the second place, the injustice of his charge will appear from the fact, that admitting I had obtained his name on the condition which he gave to the publishers; still I have not violated any pledge. The condition is as follows:—

Messrs. Eichbaum & Johnson,

GENTLEMEN—Having referred Mr. A. Campbell to you, conditionally, for my real name, as the author of letters addressed to him, over the signature of "A Regular Baptist," and by you printed; that condition is, that Mr. C. *pledge* you his word, that any thing exhibited in those letters, &c. as a fact, is false, and that he wants my name for the purpose of taking legal measures to prove the falsehood! No other consideration will reconcile me to let my name be known.

Very respectfully, yours,

A REGULAR BAPTIST.

August 17, 1824.

Now admitting that I had complied with the above condition in obtaining his name, still I have violated no such pledge as Mr. G. charges me with:—For, 1st, It required me only to say that *any thing* exhibited in those letters is false; and, in the second place, that I wanted his name for the purpose of taking legal measures to prove the falsehood. Now I have said, and proven, that many things exhibited in those letters as facts, are false. So far the first part of the condition has been complied with. And as to the second part of the condition, upon any construction of the words, I am, or may be perfectly justifiable. For on the construction of the terms "*legal measures*," as importing measures agreeable to the laws of Christ, I have taken such measures as I deem, and can prove to be, according to his laws. And, on the construction of the terms "*legal measures*," as importing that I should proceed according to the laws of the land, this I may have done for aught Mr. G. knows, and yet no civil prosecution ever commence—for the first step

in taking legal measures is to employ legal counsel. Now I may have taken such counsel, and submitted Mr. G's pamphlet to legal characters, and have received, as their opinion, that nothing in his pamphlet was *actionable*; that is, there was no *specification* in it, of a form so tangible as to become the basis of a civil suit. This may have been done for any thing Mr. G. knows; and until he knew whether or not this was done, he could not; with a *conscientious regard to truth*, say that I had violated my word in not commencing a civil suit, on the supposition that I had obtained his name according to the condition specified in his written note, left with the publishers.

These facts, had I no others to adduce, will, I conceive, satisfactorily demonstrate the injustice of Mr. G's charge. But I did not exactly obtain his name according to the above conditions. For after glancing hastily over his letters, I found in the conclusion of his last one, a *promise* to give his name to me if I applied to the publishers in my own person, and presented a *fair reason*. I did so, being in Pittsburgh at the moment. I repaired to the publishers and demanded his name. I presented a *fair reason* for demanding it. Mr. Johnson handed me a copy of the above note. I soon discovered that the *promise* in his letters was a mere deceitful manœuvre. For while he *promised* me his name on giving a *fair reason*, I found his *promise* already *broken* in the words of the note; for it was promised in his letters on *any* fair reason, and in the note it was not to be given, but on *certain* conditions. I did not comply with the conditions on the construction of the words *legal measures*, as requiring me to enter suit, provided there was just cause of a civil suit in the work. A person who had never sued a man on any account, and who had never been sued at law, does not very hastily become a client. But had I been as regardless of truth as he would wish me to be, I would have, at once, complied with the condition, and obtained his name, by saying what I did not intend. I was authorized to think that Mr. G. was the author of those letters, and thought it best, in the first instance, to have an interview with him. But on his refusal to be considered by me, or to have any conversation with me, as the author of those letters, I found it

necessary to have his name. After reading the pamphlet more minutely, and hearing the opinions of some of my friends, I was determined, next morning, to oblige the publishers to give his name, and told Mr. Johnson, in the presence of Mr. Church, that I considered the pamphlet libellous and slanderous, and was determined either to sue him, or to have the name of the author, and then to treat him according to the merits of the case. On this Mr. Johnson gave me his name—Mr. Eichbaum was not in the house at the time. Mr. Johnson thought himself justifiable in giving his name on these grounds; but I neither thanked him, nor Mr. Greatrake for it; nor for the proposition to give it, as I could, without the consent of either, obtain it on such grounds as his note stipulated. On no just grounds, then, can Mr. G. accuse me of having violated my pledged word—for, on the supposition that it was actually pledged, I have shewn in the two first items he has no grounds to authorize him to say so. And as the fact was, I never considered myself pledged to act in any other way, than as every consideration would justify. I do not, however, yet say, that I may not be obliged to appeal to Caesar. But I confess I should not like to be the means of the iniquities of this man falling upon his wife and children. Nothing but a regard to my own feelings, with respect to such suits; together with my sympathies for his wife; who, I am told, disapproves his conduct in his present course as far as every virtuous woman ought, has saved him from prosecution since I have read his last pamphlet. Whether I shall be constrained to disregard those feelings is yet uncertain.

His 2d charge is, "I have proved you guilty of slander and falsehood against me, in having published me as a *hired minister*." My words are not "*a hired minister*"—they are. (C. B. vol. 2d, p. 39,) "*this gentleman is at present hired by a party*." All that is here said is, that, at the time of writing the above in the first week of September last, Mr. G. was actually *hired* by a party. How does he prove me guilty of a falsehood here? By giving a certificate, signed by W. H. Hart, in the name of this party, without any date attached to it, "that they disavow having hired Mr. G. to be their pastor." But we are not informed whether this certificate was granted

after Mr. G. resigned being their pastor or before—*for* it is a fact that Mr. G. is not their pastor now; and it is a fact there is no date to the certificate; and it is almost certain that the certificate was drawn up by Mr. G's own pen. But it is a fact that Mr. G. was *hired* at the time I wrote my review and since that time. The following statement from a gentleman in Pittsburgh, whose wife was a member of this little band, and who ought to know something about these matters and things, thus writes to me:—

PITTSBURGH, December 26th, 1824.

Mr. Campbell—You are at liberty to use my name, if needful, in asserting the following—viz.—That Mr. Greatrake was hired by the people, calling themselves the Regular Baptist Church.—It was stipulated that he should have all the money taken up by the bags,* and one dollar and fifty cents per week beside. And that Mr. Greatrake either requested or demanded a written instrument, shewing their agreement; which request or demand was not acceded to by the body.

Z. PACKARD.

It must be acknowledged this was no great salary; yet it was Mr. G's *price*. And if a man agree to work for 150 dollars per annum, he is as really *hired* as though he had stipulated for 1000. Upon the whole, I think

* The *bags*.—I need not stop to enquire whether these *bags* were made of badger skins or goat skins—or whether they are black by nature, or out of sympathy for the minister; but they are bags fastened to the end of long poles, which, by the deacons, or other tax-gatherers, are presented, after every sermon, to the nose of every hearer, to draw from his pocket a few mites for the Lord's treasury, as it is called; or rather for the parson's pot; which tribute is supposed to be given more freely and copiously after the flock has been well fed on a seasonable discourse. These bags are never full; for they are emptied as soon as the people disperse, and thus, like the grave, are always open, and never satisfied. The flock became so small, under Mr. G's labors, that it is said at last all the *bags* of the whole house yielded sometimes only 37½ cents per week. At this crisis I think it was time for Mr. G. to resign the pastoral care of his congregation—and to go to printing another pamphlet on a topic that would make it saleable. But in justice to his congregation I should observe, that the majority of them and a number of the "Regular Baptist Church" of Pittsburgh had resigned being under the pastoral care of Mr. G. before he resigned the care of them. The only thing he has to repent of in this matter, is, that he did not resign a little sooner.

Mr. G. would have consulted more wisely for himself, had he passed the term *hired* without saying a word about it. In this way Mr. G. says he has proved that I slandered him. I must acknowledge, however, that it is somewhat agreeable to me to find, that the most dull of apprehension, in the clerical kingdom, begin to think it a slander to be represented as being *hired* for a stipulated sum to act the pastor or the preacher. It must be evident to all, that I am exonerated from the charge of stating a falsehood in this instance, as I have given evidence, and can produce more, that Mr. G. preached or spoke for a stipulated sum.

His third charge we shall dispose of with the same ease. It is this---“I have clearly proved you guilty of slander and falsehood against the Regular Baptist Church at Pittsburgh, in your “Christian Baptist,” that they were “an excluded party from a regular Baptist church.” Why did he not give the whole of my words---“at least by a church, which, at the time of their exclusion, was recognized as such”? This would not serve his purpose, and therefore it was best to leave it out!! The proof Mr. G. adduces to shew that they were not an excluded party, is the decision of a committee invited by the excluded party, not according to the decision of the association. I will here publish the resolution adopted by the association and the decision of the committee, and then compare them:—

“*Resolved*, That it be recommended to both parties” [the excluding and the excluded] “to agree to apply to the five nearest churches to send them such help as they can; to endeavor to compromise their difficulties, and that the farther consideration of this subject be indefinitely postponed,”

Minutes of the Redstone Association, under the 11th item of business—
1823.

DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE.

“Whereas a request has been made by certain individuals of the Baptist Church of Pittsburgh, [the excluded party only,] according to a resolution of the association, for a committee of five neighboring churches to meet at Pittsburgh, on the 11th October, 1823, to consult on certain points of doctrine which have occasioned misunderstanding between the members—We, the undersigned, do agree that there is just ground of complaint against the doctrines protested against by certain members of this church, and

that all the members who adhere to the doctrine on which this church was first constituted, be considered by us the existing Regular Baptist Church in Pittsburgh.

[Signed by thirteen persons.]

This is Mr. Greatrake's proof that they were not excluded; and also a letter is adduced, written by Mr. Wheeler, the July before the association met, having no bearing upon the subject now before us.

On this committee and decision we must offer a few remarks:—

1st. It was not called by both parties, as the resolution required. It was called by the excluded.

2d. It was not composed of the five nearest churches; but of such churches as the excluded party selected.

3d. It was resolved that they should endeavor to compromise difficulties, which was not attempted, nor could it be attempted, as but one party called the committee.

4th. The committee declares, in its preamble to their decision, that they came in accordance to "a resolution of the association, to consult on certain points of doctrine which have occasioned misunderstanding among the members;" whereas the resolution specified no such consultation about certain points of doctrine.

5th. It decided that the party that called it was the existing Regular Baptist Church of Pittsburgh, which was no part of the business that belonged to it, according to the resolution of the association. So that they did that which they ought not to have done, and left undone that which they ought to have done.

I sincerely respect and love some of the members of this committee, and am sorry that I am compelled to examine their decision. I believe they meant well, and expected to do good by their decision; but the event has proved they were mistaken. I have only to regret that the *protest* of one of this committee was not recorded and attached to its decision. This is a measure of common justice, which the sacred historian faithfully attests to. He enters the *protest* of one individual against the decision of his compeers. Luke xxiii. 51.

I cannot dismiss this decision without admiring the modesty and diffidence of the undersigned, which, indeed, like charity, covers many blemishes. They, very consistently and modestly say, that this party ^{is} be con-

sidered by US [thirteen] the existing Regular Baptist Church of Pittsburgh." They profess no power, authority, nor control over the judgment of others, but leave every individual, or any other *thirteen* persons, to think otherwise if they please. The spirit and temper of mind which they exhibit, is worthy of admiration and imitation amongst all those who are called to decide who are, or who are not, Regular Baptist churches.*

But the previous question remains as it was—Did the Association declare that the church that excluded these members was not a regular Baptist church at the time it excluded them—or even at the time it adopted the above resolution? I answer no. Again, was not this party excluded because of unbecoming conduct, and not for mere matters of opinion. I answer yes. But the important question that at once settles this matter as respects the charge preferred against me, remains yet to be proposed. It is this: *Did not the party that called the council, and that covenanted with Mr. G. consider themselves an EXCLUDED PARTY—and blame the other brethren for SEPARATING them?* I boldly answer YES; and I will produce their own names in attestation thereof.

Extract of a letter addressed to those who excluded, or separated from themselves, the undersigned:—

—"Instead of taking up our sentiments, or removing any objections, or endeavoring to convince us of any errors into which you might imagine we have fallen—you have, contrary to all scripture, religion, reason, justice, or humanity, and in direct opposition to the *laws of love* by which you profess to be actuated and regulated, without hesitation, or without any attempt to reclaim us from error; in the most unscriptural, and, in our apprehensions, ungodly manner, SEPARATED us from you, and, as you suppose, DELIVERED US TO SATAN."

A. SINCLAIR, *Deacon*,
W. H. HART, *Clerk*,
ELIJAH CLAYTON,
DAVID BOWEN,
WM. BOWEN,
HOLLAND SUMNER,
JONATHAN DAVIS,
CHARITY SINCLAIR,

RUTH PETERS,
LEAH CLAYTON,
SARAH FORD,
MARY ASHLEY,
ELIZABETH CARR,
MARY JORDAN,
MARY DAVIS.

* I care not a fig about the names of regular or irregular Baptist churches—nor about the power of associations in such matters and things. But I now contend with those who make the name *regular*

So it appears that this party, in their *own protest*, in their *own language*, and in their *own names*, declare themselves to be SEPARATED from their brethren and DELIVERED OVER TO SATAN. With what justice, then, O reader! could this Mr. G. charge me with slander and falsehood in representing this party as an *excluded party*, when I have their *own words and names* for it!!!

The reader will observe that I do not enter into the merits of the case, whether a church of nearly a *hundred* members, as this party in their protest declares, had a right to exclude these *fifteen* persons; or whether they had a right to do it without an unanimous vote; or whether they made use of proper measures in reference to them; or whether the words in the above protest are accordant to fact:—I say, I enter not into this investigation; all that I do, is to produce their own testimony in confirmation, that I did not *slander* them, nor publish a falsehood, when I represented them as an *excluded party*. The reader must, by this time, understand how easy a matter it is for this Mr. G. to say, "I have proved you guilty of slander and falsehood," when he pleases.

CHAP. III.

MY AVARICE.

MY opposition to the monied schemes of those self-styled preachers of the gospel, and to the hireling system now in full tide, has rendered me obnoxious to the severest denunciations of the salary men and their infatuated advocates. Amongst these salary preachers Mr. Greatrake is one, as has been shewn. To frustrate my efforts, is, with such men as he, a great desideratum. Hannibal, the Carthaginian, was not more determined against Scipio, the Roman, than this gentleman has de-

equivalent to *holy*, and the power of associations equal to the power of a synod; and, on their own principles, I contend that the party now called the "Regular Baptist Church of Pittsburgh," is a very *irregular* Baptist church. And on regular Baptist principles, they never can become a regular Baptist church until the measures specified in the resolution of Association be complied with, and until a decision made on that resolution be submitted to, and approved by, the Association.

clared himself against me. It has occurred to him, as it once did to my worthy friend Thomas G. Jones of Wooster, that, to represent me as one actuated by avarice in all my efforts, would be a master blow at my influence. Let it be believed that I am impelled by cupidity in all that I say, write, or do, against the schemes I oppose, and then I become impotent as Sampson shorn.

But by what means, and by what rational process, is the charge made out? The whole grounds, documents, and proof of the charge are embraced in the fact, that I have caused to be published three volumes—two Debates and the Christian Baptist. My having labored in the word and doctrine, for many years, without fee or reward; affords to such reasoners no evidence that I am not avaricious. But my having caused to be published the aforesaid works, is proof positive that I am sordidly cupidious of gain. To help the matter, Mr. G. presented, in his first pamphlet, a tabular view of the costs of publishing, and the profits accruing from the sale of so many books. In this table every thing was false, and just accommodated to give such a result as would suit the object of its projector. In his second table every thing is false, except the number of the copies of the two volumes on Baptism. But it is a matter of no moment to me, whether his estimate be esteemed correct or incorrect. On either hypothesis, I will be exonerated by every man of common sense, from the charge of being actuated by avarice in these matters—when I shall have plead my cause in this chapter. But this courteous gentleman will not allow me to plead my own cause, or to bring forth testimony to disprove his imputations. If I plead my own cause, then I become guilty of self-adulation; if I bring forth evidence in my favor, then I publish my own “liberalities,” and tell of “favors bestowed.” Thus, while I attempt my justification from one impeachment, I make myself liable to another. Mr. G. treats me as the good people of New England, in the time of the *blue laws*, are said to have treated those unhappy beings who were accused of witchcraft. The witch was brought to some pool, or river, into which she was cast. If she made her escape from the water, she was then indubitably a witch, and to be put to death; but if she was drowned, then she was innocent of witch-

craft; but, unfortunately, her innocence was proved at the expense of her life. Thus, in the present case, I am accused of avarice because I have published so many copies of a work which was loudly called for by hundreds; and when it became necessary to set aside his accusations, to disclose the fact, that 4500 copies of this work were the property of other men, and that I stood personally and individually bound for the whole expense, then I became ostentatious of my liberality, and so mean as to tell of "favors bestowed"!!²⁴

But how this Mr. G. could reiterate his former accusations, and that, too, after admitting the fact that but *one-fourth* of the last edition was mine, and after being told that I was proprietor of only *the half* of the Christian Baptist, is only to be explained upon his declaration, that he is determined to destroy my influence. Such, no doubt, appear to him, means lawful to be used in so good a cause. For the end justifies the means.

But on the supposition that every word of his estimate was according to fact, and allowing every copy, of which I am the proprietor, was sold; and the entire amount actually received—What then? For fifteen years of my life, the time spent in active and laborious services in what I conceive the cause of truth, I have received something like 150 dollars per annum. Noble achievement! Convincing proof of my avarice!! But I will prove, by and by, that his estimate is altogether incorrect.

In the next place, as I am determined to explode this imputation, every way false and foul; were I actuated by the love of gain, would not the same capital, the same credit, and the same labor, employed in any department of business or trade, be more lucratively and more safely employed; than in scattering it into several thousand hands, dispersed over several states, and liable to so many casualties? This I submit to the considera-

* Mr. Sala thinks it no reproach to be poor, as Mr. G. would have it. He is only concerned about being *honest*. The man who feels ashamed, on who is mortified, because of his poverty, when it is not of his own making, has yet to learn the first lessons of the Christian religion. And he that contemns a good man, because he is poor, never knew any thing of the religion of Him who had not where to repose his head.

sion of those who are capable of judging correctly in such matters, and who are disposed to judge according to evidence; and to such only I appeal. To create a new heart in my accuser, and to give him new eyes, is not in my power. and his present avowed object of destroying my influence, prevents, and will no doubt prevent, any corrections of the truth of any documents or proofs that may be submitted.

Again—could I not, let my friends and foes say, by an entire cessation from all efforts, either *viva voce* or by the pen, in the cause to which I am at present devoted—by turning my attention to law and politics, in all human probability, realize incomparably more money in five years than even the golden dreams of this sagacious calculator have given me for fifteen years? Or supposing I had subscribed to a Presbyterian creed fifteen years ago, might I not have had 500 or a 1000 dollars a-year, instead of the 150 which Mr. G's estimate has given me? And might I not have published, as some Presbyterian teachers do, a magazine devoted to the popular schemes of the age, and have added more to my *stated salary* than his estimate has given me for *all* my labors? But this is all self-adulation, he will say. Well, be it so. The question then will be, Who made it necessary? At all risques I will say, that were I to offer my services as a "minister" for hire, I would not labor as much as I have done for less than 500 dollars per annum in the country, and twice that sum in a city. Nor would I sell myself for *this* sum as an avaricious man. Were gain my object, I would set a much higher price on my labors, and I would seek the best market. If such be not the common course of those devoted to gain, I leave the public to judge. I would not insult the good sense of my readers by deducing the conclusions from these premises, which, at first sight, present themselves to their view.

But, again—might not Mr. G. on the same grounds he has attacked me, attack almost all the editors of the religious books, magazines, and papers of the age. What shall we say of his neighbor, the "*Recorder*," who has criminated me for attacking the schemes by which he has frankly owned he gains his bread? Some of the editors of the more popular periodical works

profess to give the profits of their papers to Missionary and other benevolent institutions. But how much have they contributed? How many dollars are accredited, in the reports of treasurers of these institutions, to these papers and magazines, with two or three thousand subscribers? Has any one of them given one, two, or three hundred dollars a-year, as the profits to those institutions, to the interests of which they are professedly devoted? We want some light on this subject. Let Mr. G. then, impartially accuse them all, as a pack of unregenerated, avaricious men. Let him publish an estimate of the profits of those gentlemen of the district of Columbia—of Philadelphia, and Boston, accruing to them from their theological labors. Let him inform us of the number of subscribers on their respective lists, the costs, and profits of their respective establishments. Let him give an exhibit of the Boston Magazine, the Columbian Star, the Luminary, the Presbyterian magazines, and weekly papers, and disclose to us what avaricious gentry they are. Let him give us an estimate, (for he is an adept in making estimates,) of the profits resulting to all the Doctors of Divinity from their numerous publications, funeral orations, marriage fees, and stated salaries; and then prove that they are *all unregenerated, avaricious knaves*. We shall then give him the credit of sincerity, consistency, and honesty. Till then, we shall contemplate him as his two pamphlets present him to our apprehensions.

Let me ask the enlightened reader, what has Mr. G's insinuations to do with the sentiments I advocate? Do they prove them erroneous? If I gained or lost 5000 dollars a-year, their truth and value remain unaffected by such incidents. The truth of Christianity is the same truth, and of equal importance whether persecuted, or patronized by the civil government. The truth of every topic I have propounded or discussed, remains as it was when all his insinuations and reproaches are heard and weighed. But calumny and detraction, misrepresentation and reproach, are always introduced, or resorted to, by those, and those only, who are conscious of their imbecility, otherwise to attack the sentiments which they fear, or hate, as injurious to their interest, or reputation.

It remains only briefly to state, as the best possible proof of the incorrect exhibit of the profits of this establishment, which this accuser has given, that Mr. Sala, my partner in the publication of the Debate and Christian Baptist, has disposed of his half of the establishment, and preferred being employed as a journeyman, without risque, to his continuance as a partner, entitled to half of all proceeds.

Here is the proof of the above:—

I would, with a reference to the calumnies of Lawrence Great-rake against A. Campbell, inform the public, that although I was entitled, by agreement, to the half of the profits accruing from every thing published in this office, I *greatly preferred*, not long since, to sell, for first cost, my interest in the establishment, and to be employed by A. Campbell as a journeyman, on the usual wages; having proved by experience that the risques are too great, and the profits too small, to justify my continuance as a co-partner with him.

SOLOMON SALA.

The argument, then, stands thus, that if Mr. Sala, who was doubtless acquainted with the whole concern—with all risques, profits, and expenses incident to the establishment, preferred the usual wages of a journeyman, in constant employment, guaranteed to him without risque, to the half of Mr. G's imagined profits; then Mr. S. is a perfect simpleton, or Mr. G. has given a most exaggerated and false statement.

I need not spend the reader's time in examining, nor my own in pointing out, item for item, the palpable errors given in his exhibit, nor in submitting the proof, as the above fact amply proves it every way false.

I have read and heard of persons relating miracles, who, while they labored to persuade others of their truth, did not themselves believe them. I have sometimes thought something like this might be the "moral complexion" of Mr. G's mind. But to remove all doubt of this matter, and also to satisfy public curiosity, I will now assure the public, that if Mr. Great-rake will employ any agent, whose style of address is a little more polite and gentlemanly than his own, to negotiate for him, I will sell him my interest in the 1st volume of the Christian Baptist, and the whole of my interest in this enriching Debate, for the first cost. If Mr. G. has not the means, he can find some friend, no doubt, that will

enable him to realize so handsome a speculation, according to his estimate.

If Mr. G. will not, within a month after the appearance of this proposal, accede to it, I pledge myself hereby to give any gentleman the same opportunity of realizing something handsome. Let this offer now be accepted, or let us hear no more of my avarice.

Once more, on this main charge of Mr. G. As I intend, to the utmost of my ability, to prosecute the work already begun; and as I am determined to give no occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully; and as I wish to publish sundry works, among which will be *Campbell's*, *Macknight's*, and *Doddridge's Translation of the New Testament*, in one volume, in order to put into the hands of those who have not money to purchase, education to understand, nor leisure to read all the critical and theological notes attached to these volumes, now selling at 42 dollars—I say, as I wish to put into the hands of the Christian community these most valuable translations, in one vol. 8vo. at a fair price, I shall make an attempt to accomplish it; and as I am determined to prosecute the work on hands, I would offer my printing establishment for sale to any person or persons who will give assurance that, so long as I may wish to continue, they will keep it in operation according to my will—and they shall have the whole profits resulting therefrom; after remunerating me the usual allowances for writing and correcting the press. I will also assure them, that I will not request them to publish any work which I would not feel myself obliged to issue were the risks and profits my own. It is also to be a condition of sale, that Mr. Sala be continued as journeyman in the establishment, at the usual prices, or at the wages which he now receives. I will receive proposals for the above sale and arrangement for six months. As an inducement to purchasers, I will further state, that, since Mr. G's first effort to destroy my influence made its appearance, more than 200 subscribers have been added to the list.

I am not, then, to be understood as willing, from any disappointment in my calculations, to sell what has already been published on the terms proposed; but as willing to sell the whole establishment with a reference

to what may be undertaken hereafter. But while I live, and Heaven inclines and enables me to proceed, I will not, I cannot, abandon the cause I have undertaken. I have only to add, that should Mr. G. or any other person, attempt to destroy my influence by accusing me of acting from avarice in these efforts, they will, before they reiterate the above calumny, pay a rational and becoming attention to every paragraph in this chapter.

I conclude this item by observing that Mr. G's estimate, which, with the greatest propriety of speech, in my review of his first pamphlet, I called a *forgery*, is, as I conceive, more satisfactorily repelled by the above statements, than by any assertions I could make about it.

CHAP. IV.

MR. G. in his recapitulation of accusations, has so often repeated the same things over and over, with so much variation in the style as merely prevents them from being verbally the same, that it becomes a transgression on the patience of the reader to follow him in all his display of items. We shall, however, let no item, worthy of notice, pass without examination in the order of their importance. Next to the charge of avarice, is that of *unfair dealing*, in selling the copy-right of my first Debate to Messrs. Eichbaum & Johnson.

It seldom happens, in the history of human life and human action, that any man, however correct, may not commit errors; and even when there is no error in his conduct, he may not be able to justify his conduct, when the tongue of slander and the lips of envy are moved against him. But I feel myself peculiarly happy, that in relation to every item of slander in Mr. G's pamphlet I am able to repel it in the face of public investigation without the fear of dishonor. I have, under this item of charge, an opportunity presented to me of exposing, in one instance, the injustice of Mr. G's estimate of gain which will serve as an additional evidence how easy would be to expose the whole, when examined item by item. But for the remarks of Mr. G. a second time, on this incident, this proof of his unfairness would, like many others in my possession, have remained hidden from public view.

Though not contradicted in my remarks on his first exhibit, it is false that I gained three hundred dollars, or received three hundred dollars for the copy-right. I received as good as *two* hundred. I got 150 copies of the work, at the retail price of one dollar, which were worth 100 dollars at 1-3 per cent, the usual allowance at that time on large sales of books. The publishers of books, for many years past, sell, for prompt payment, at wholesale prices, at an allowance of 1-3 per cent. One hundred dollars, then, I received in Debates; and 150 dollars worth of other books, which, at the same discount, was equivalent to another hundred dollars. Here there is no reflexion on Messrs. Eichbaum & Johnson, for so I stipulated. Two hundred dollars, then, would, at that time, have purchased all the books I got for the copy-right. But to come more directly to the charge of *unfair dealing*—I would observe, that before I talked with Messrs. E. & J. on the subject of a second edition, I had received sundry applications for the copy-right for particular states—for Ohio, for New York, and Maryland. 'Tis true Mr. G. may put "the negative" on this, as he says he has done on my remarks of certain offers which were made me in Pittsburgh and elsewhere. He may tell me very politely, that he does not believe it, and tell me to give the names of those gentlemen to remove his incredulity; and, after the names are adduced, tell me how unkind and "mean" it is to mention the names of gentlemen without their consent, in proof of my veracity, as he has already done in another instance. But as we write not for the conviction of Mr. G. but for those who are not so incredulous, we shall suffer him to enjoy his incredulity; at the same time, whenever it becomes necessary for public conviction, we stand pledged and ready to prove all that was said before on these offers, and all that we now affirm concerning offers made to purchase the copy-right for those individual states. Had I been disposed to speculate in the sale of that work, I might, in all human probability, have sold the right to each of the persons applying for a particular state for as much as I asked from Messrs. E. & J. for the whole United States. My reasons for preferring to publish a second edition myself, or to sell it in Pittsburgh, were, the greater facility offered for a general

dispersion of the work, and the prospect of the work being more neatly executed; as the applications were from newspaper offices—at least, I am sure, that the application from Wilmington, Ohio, was from a newspaper office, and I think the others also. Besides, I was about adding *Strictures* on Dr. Raiston's Letters, and for my own convenience wished to have the work executed nearer home.

I am sorry to impose on the patience of my readers by such dry and uninteresting details, and especially in repelling calumnies from such an accuser; but I act upon the principle, that if a strumpet or a highwayman accuse the most virtuous citizen of any gross misdeed, it becomes necessary, in most instances, to stoop to repel it.

To have done with this item, I will at once give Mr. G's charge in full, with the *testimony* that repels it—He says, "You will recollect, sir, that you succeeded in disposing of the copy-right of your Debate to these gentlemen upon *stating your veracity* as a man, and an acquaintance, and minister—[For what, he does not tell us—the next sentence being independent of this. Here he leaves a chasm to be filled up by the ingenuity of the reader]—"that you *assured* them that the religious public on the seaboard were eager to obtain the work. and that an edition of 3000 copies would sell readily and to advantage there." This is what no man of sense could assure any person, or any man of sense believe upon a mere assurance. I could not, and would not assure any man, that 3000 copies of the New Testament would sell in all the eastern states in three years. The ideas which Mr. G. in the above insinuations, wishes to communicate, are these: I succeeded in selling the copy-right to those gentlemen by false statements and representations—and completely *took them in*, as we say, by a "sordid artifice"—consequently, that those gentlemen have just cause to censure me for *unfair dealing*. We shall now let them speak for themselves:—

WE DO CERTIFY, That we do not censure Alexander Campbell with regard to any representations made by him to us at the time of selling us the copy-right of his Debate with Mr. Walker.

We must confess, however, that we did not like his publishing a subsequent Debate, as we thought it detrimental to the sale of the book we had published. Mr. Campbell thinks not. Whether

or not, we will not pretend to say, not having read either of the books with sufficient attention to enable us to say, whether his late Debate would be conducive to, or operate against, the sale of the first Debate.

We are in justice bound to Mr. Campbell to say, further, that his representations did not wholly influence us in the determination to publish the work. We printed it as book-publishers, with a view to gain, at the same time knowing there was a risque.

EICHBAUM & JOHNSON.

Pittsburgh, Dec. 28, 1824.

As the Debate with Mr. M'Calla was, though on the same topic, on grounds radically different from that with Mr. Walker, and quite a different work, we considered it no more unjust, after the sale of the copy-right of the one, to publish another of a different character, than it would be for a person who had sold the copy-right of a map of the world on the globular projection, afterwards to publish, and even to sell the copy-right of another, on Mercator's projection. Besides, had I had on hands an edition of the Debate with Mr. Walker, I would have published that with Mr. M'Calla—as the two works take up the question on the only two popular grounds of argument, on which the Paido-Baptist system depends.

It appears, then, from the above testimony, that, with respect to the sale of the copy-right to Messrs. E. & J. I am, in their own judgment, blameless—Mr. G's grievous charge to the contrary notwithstanding.

CHAP. V.

HAVING now examined the primary means which Mr. G. has used "to destroy my influence," I shall pay a due attention to his subordinate efforts.

He says—"I have exhibited the very circumstances [of my retirement from public notice for ten years] that you advert to, as evidence of your not being ambitious—as evidence of the reverse"—That is, every ambitious man (for this is necessary to his conclusion) spends many years in retirement, projecting some grand scheme by means of which he is to come into great notoriety—yet the circumstances that bring him before the public are not of his own originating!!

Again, he says—"I have shewn that your resort to the mere verbal or indifferent mistakes [i. e. the falsehoods in which Mr. G. was detected in my Review] of those who oppose you, as *falsehoods*, shews that your mind has much dalliance with the subject—that it is deeply imbued therewith." If it were lawful to condescend to imitate Mr. G. in any thing—I would here retort—that Mr. G.'s resort to the calumnies of avarice and vanity, as means to destroy my influence, shews that his mind has much dalliance with these subjects—that it is deeply imbued therewith.

Mr. G.'s aberrations from moral rectitude, exhibited in my review of his letters, he now graciously makes mere *mistakes*. He softens them all down to mere insignificant and frivolous "mistakes;"—but my exposition of them becomes, in his last attack, either "*direct or indirect falsehoods*." Even what he acknowledges to be, in his own apprehension, a mere insinuation, becomes a downright falsehood:—for every exposition of his letters is either a falsehood or a slander.

Such is, 1st, my insinuation, that "he wanted his name known as a gratification to his vanity; whereas the fact is, he did every thing to prevent its being made public that in *justice* to me I could do."—Now where he found this *insinuation* I do not know,—he found a smile, somewhere, at his promise or prophecy, that his name would be known to us on earth only by the name of a "Regular Baptist." This smile at his weakness, becomes, in his creative imagination, an insinuation;—and this insinuation becomes, next moment, an indirect falsehood, and then his wrath burns with an implacable fury. But I need not say that every man of sense will either laugh at, or pity his declaration, that *justice* to me was the cause of his giving a *promise* to give me his real name on presenting "a fair reason." I viewed it then, and I view it now, as a mere measure of policy, to save his letters from the deserved character of anonymous abuse, or a thrust in the dark. And now his being dragged out of his beloved mask, instead of being a gratification to his vanity, appears to have occasioned painful forebodings, and to have raised his resentment to a paroxysm.

2d. My calling at his house, and my efforts to address him as the author of those letters, before I got his name

from the publishers, although I was then almost as certain of his authorship as I am now; and my allusion to circumstances which I thought well calculated to convince him that it was in vain to attempt to secret it, are also construed into indirect falsehood. By telling him that I was at the publishers' office was a fact, and my expressions, which he called equivocal, might have appeared so to him. But there was in this transaction nothing said on my part that cannot now be justified. Besides, perhaps he does not know, that, from circumstances which transpired, while making enquiry about his name, I felt myself emboldened to address him then as the author, although not with that *formality* I now use. Something worse than an "indirect falsehood" occurred on Mr. G's side during this interview, which we shall notice in its own place.

3d. My not publishing the *twelve* falsehoods stated concerning Mr. Church's baptism, is another crime of which I have been guilty. It was "cruel" to mention them without specifying them. "Church, and you, and Scott have only been able to state *five* of the *twelve* you charge me with." I have never tried my ability yet. I did not state one of them. I only said Mr. Church had convicted him of a round dozen in presence of myself and Mr. Scott. Mr. Scott mentioned *five*, it seems, in his Reply; and no doubt considered those the more important or tangible. But was this an effort to the utmost of his ability? This must be made appear, before it can, with any regard to truth, be said that he was able to specify only *five* of *twelve*. I shall now try how many I am able to specify:—

1. He, Mr. Church, says Mr. G. has borne the name, and made the profession, of almost every sect in Christendom.

Mr. Church declared he professed Presbyterianism, was an Independent, and is now a Baptist; which is so far from being almost all, that it is not the 12th part of the sects in Christendom.

2. Mr. G. specifies—that he made the profession of a Catholic.†
Never.

3. That he made the profession of an Episcopalian.
Never.

† Mr. G. puts the word say, before this proposition; and thereby requests the reader to say what he has before affirmed about every sect in Christendom; so that he gives each of these as a specification, and would thus impose these false propositions on the public.

4. That he made the profession of a Methodist.

Never.

5. That he made the profession, and bore the name, of Universalist.

Never.

6. That he made the profession of a Socinian.

Never.

7. Mr. Church, on his application for Baptism, Mr. G. declares, "says that he will join your society."

He did not say so.

8. And at his induction deliver an address upon baptism.

He did not.

9. "At the water he delivers an harangue of 5 hours in length."

He spoke but three hours and a quarter by several watches.

10. He gives a recitation of what you—have published on that ordinance.

Mr. G. did not hear him, I trow; and his informant must have been asleep, for his discourse was upon creeds, confessions, the national covenant and solemn league, and all that was said about baptism occupied but a few minutes, and that was chiefly, if not altogether, in reading the scriptures.

11. Mr. Church holds—"the delusion—that baptism is salvation."

He declared no such an opinion, and told Mr. Greatrake he never thought so.

12. Mr. Church "exhibited—a fitful scene of profession and reprofession."

Mr. Church never *reprofessed* any system he once discarded.

13. You took notes of—and made a record of what this poor deluded man said about the mode of baptism.

I did not make a record of one expression that Mr. C. uttered on the subject or mode of baptism. Nor did I profess to do it.

14. The vanity of the society to which he has connected himself, is gratified in being numerically enlarged.

Not so. He has attached himself to no society. No more than the eunuch whom Philip baptized attached himself to the church at Jerusalem.

Here are *fourteen* which I have been able to specify; and I do not now recollect the whole of Mr. Church's specifications. But so it is—in one half page I have found as many as will justify the assertion of one round dozen.

But this is not the worst circumstance in his attack on Mr. Church. He promised, three times, to make a public recantation of his misrepresentations, and never did it;—once in the presence of Mr. Scott and myself,—once in the presence of Mr. Rigdon and Mr. Scott, and once in his letter to Mr. Church, in these words—"I will, with pleasure, avail myself of the earliest opportunity to correct any such mistake, and remove the consequent

impressions from the mind of the public." This he has never done. And pleads now, that Mr. Church's speaking of him as he deserved, "*has cancelled the obligation*"!!! Yes, indeed!—because Mr. Church, grieved at his delay, and provoked at his treatment, in defending himself spoke of his attack without flattery—the *obligation of a solemn promise is cancelled!* This is no way strange—in the Priesthood:—for some teach that oaths made to heretics are not obligatory.

In like manner he has treated his own word and declaration in the presence of Messrs. Scott and Church, respecting the full recantation which I demanded of him, and the partial one which he made. On more mature deliberation, I presume, he found himself in such pitiable plight, that, to fulfil his promise to Mr. Church, and to do justice to me, would only accelerate his own catastrophe; and, therefore, preferred the precarious result of a *denial* of the one and a *refusal* to fulfil the other, though *three* times pledged, to the awful consequences of falling by his own hand.

I have now duly noticed every item in his own recapitulation of items of charges against me—and I now leave it to the good sense of the reader to determine how far Mr. G. has succeeded in "making a breach in my character which I will never be able to repair." Has he substantiated one single accusation? Has he adduced one single immoral action in all the transactions of my life which he attacks? Has he proved me guilty of a violation of promise, of unfair dealing, of avarice, of vanity, of slander, or falsehood? Has he not proved the very reverse; and more fully demonstrated his own position, that my "*extrinsic character is good*," than the testimony of a thousand friends? Indeed, I am much indebted to his *efforts*, though nothing to his *intentions*, for the best recommendation of my course of life I ever obtained from any individual. He sets out with this declaration, that "not more determined was the spirit of Amalechir's son in opposition to the Roman, than is mine to you as a Baptist minister"—and adds, "my right to oppose you may be, as it has already been, disputed; my inability manifest; but *my disposition shall not be questioned*." He goes, in full conformity to his *disposition*, from house to house; he hails every person

whom he supposes to be a religious opponent of mine; he examines every person with whom I have had any dealings, to whom he could have access; he asks them questions, without telling his intentions; he either goes in person, or sends his *four* ambassadors in ambush, to interrogate, and pump, and circumvent the persons who have been in my employ, who have eaten at my table, and sat by my fire. He keeps in constant employ his four runners, tattlers, or spies. Scarcely has any person escaped the toll-office on the Monongahela bridge, who is supposed to have seen me or known any thing of me, until he is hailed and importuned. And now what has been the result of this terrible ordeal? Though I cannot thank him, he has done me the best service—and has added more to my reputation than all my friends. My “vanity” has been gratified more in this instance than ever before. “But where are thine accusers?” Yes, where is Mr. G. and his *four* missionaries? The calumny is repelled, and the evidence adduced. Now let Mr. G. try it again! Let him begin a new crusade, or let him confess his faults and seek for mercy. It is true he cannot now fall. He may kiss the dust, or bite the earth without breaking a bone.

CHAP. VI.

MR. G. after his attack on my reputation, gives a “miniature portrait” of what he calls my “theology.” To contend with his opinions, or to defend my views from his misrepresentations, and thus to have to discuss any religious question with a reference to what he has written, appears to me to be similar to entering into a religious controversy with a highwayman, who was determined on murder and robbery. Should I be attacked on the highway by a robber or murderer, who, while in the act of robbing and killing me, would propose some religious opinion or speculation, as a subject of debate, I would tell him that his conduct was so incompatible

* There is strong reason to believe that one of the *four* has deserted the employment of Mr. G. from some disgust, and that he is now reduced to the actual services and friendship of three

with any kind of religious principle, that I could not think of arguing any point with him, or of noticing his dogmas, while he pursued such a course. I would tell him that I would, in this instance, rather see him exhibit the common virtues of justice and humanity, than either hear him state, or be the means of proselyting him to, the most orthodox system in the world. As incompatible would it be for me to notice any of the religious opinions of Mr. G. But not only would it be incompatible with a reference to his dispositions and conduct exhibited towards me; but in addition to this, his peculiar ignorance of language and scripture forbid, most peremptorily, any other notice of his opinions, than merely to justify my passing them by without a single reprehension. This last sentence will require some explanation, and we shall now develope its import, and attempt to justify the sentiment it exhibits.

1. Mr. G's prayer for me exhibits a disposition of mind totally irreconcilable with any pretensions to the Christian name, and, taken in connection with another part of his pamphlet, is the most glaring proof of *hypocrisy* I ever knew any man give of himself. Page 33, he says to the religious public—"let the poor man have an interest in your warmest prayers—for indeed he needs it." Now this is kind and benevolent in appearance;—but when we put this along-side of what he says, p. 31, it becomes downright *hypocrisy* and *malevolence*. The interest, in the warmest prayers of the religious public, which he wishes me to have, he thus expresses:—"Pray that God would take off his **RESTRAINING GRACE** from the man, that he may be known to you in his true character, as Hazael was to the prophet Elisha"!!!! "The restraining grace of God" is that grace which keeps natural men from the commission of the most flagrant crimes—For when the restraining grace of God, as it is called, was taken off Hazael, the case referred to for illustration, the prophet Elisha told him—"I know the evil thou wilt do unto the children of Israel; their strong holds wilt thou set on fire, their young men wilt thou slay with the sword, and wilt dash their children, and rip up their women with child." This is the case he refers to, I again repeat, to illustrate what he means by taking off the restraining grace. This was the true character

of Hazael; but while the restraining grace was upon him, he did not appear in his true character. Now, that that I might become a *Hazael* in those crimes, is just literally, and truly, without coloring, what Mr. G. tells his regenerated friends to pray for. This part in their warmest prayers is what he assigns me. Here I shall suppress all my feelings, and beg the reader to pause and reflect.

"Yes," adds he, "PRAY TO GOD FOR THIS. And that he would take out of the world every Baptist minister," [slay them in vengeance, and leave not one,] "and overthrow every Baptist church, so called, who give any countenance or support to the man—either event would be a great blessing to you, and a *great blessing demands great supplication*." Yes, and **GREAT EFFORTS** too. Whips, racks, gibbets, and tortures where are you now! Should I not bind this man to the peace! Is my life secure while a regenerated Regular Baptist Minister publishes these sentiments, and exhorts to the warmest prayers in behalf of my destruction!!! Shall I reply to the religious sentiments or opinions of such a Christian!! No, indeed! Until he repents and makes acknowledgements, the most sincere and profound, were he to write, and write, and write in opposition to my views, I would not, I could not notice his opinions, nor defend my own against his opposition. Michael, the archangel, could not contend with him. So much, then, for what I mean by his *disposition*,—his hypocrisy, and malevolence.

With regard to the second member of the above sentence, I am sorry I have to be more plain—*his ignorance of the scripture*. The above prayer is itself sufficient proof. I only add, that the man who would argue in justification of the palpable errors I exposed in my review of his first pamphlet, forfeits all pretensions to an acquaintance with the scriptures.

His ignorance of language I should not now have noticed, had it not been for his remarks on Mr. Walter Scott's Reply. This Reply Mr. Greentrake could not encounter; and, therefore, he only cursed it and its author as he passed. "Mr. Scott, says he, the writer of that, I am informed is called one of the best teachers in Pittsburgh; it is well he did not put that in his book, or

the intellectual character of Pittsburgh would have received a most cruel injury. To judge of his *attic story* from the pamphlet he has written, and one would say that it is like a poet's wardrobe—every thing after its kind—*piteously threadbare!* If that pamphlet has not occasioned him the loss of many of his scholars, I shall marvel at it.”—This is of a piece with his prayer. It intimates the same malevolence towards Mr. S. the same good wishes for his prosperity. What has this to do with the subject of Mr. Scott's Reply. It only exhibits Mr. G's perfect incompetency to “*untwist it.*” as he says. But let it be remembered that Mr. G. pronounces condemnation upon it, in a *literary point of view*; consequently he sets himself up as a *literary critic*. Now, after his apology to me, in his pamphlet, for his ignorance of letters, I should have let him pass without a single remark, had it not been that he again arrogates to himself some knowledge of letters, and makes pretensions to some degree of *critical acumen*. Now what shall we say of the man who pronounces condemnation upon the *literary character* of a master in composition, who, himself, does not know the first rule of English syntax, or the tenses of an English verb. And that this is truly and without exaggeration, the literary character of Mr. G. every grammarian, who has once read either of his pamphlets, is infallibly assured of. I will admit cheerfully that “Homer sometimes nods;” that the best writers sometimes commit errors, and that there are certain oversights in the best compositions, which never interfere with the character of the writer, as a grammarian or an accomplished scholar. But when we have the same errors repeated on all occasions, and in every form where there is any possibility of their occurrence, we at once enter into the pericranium of the writer, and form a perfect acquaintance with the uncultivated state of his faculties. But we always like to produce the proof:—

1. *Proof that he does know the meaning of, or difference between, the perfect and imperfect tense.*

ERRORS.

CORRECTIONS.

1. I could then have *got*.
2. That have ever *sew*.
3. I have now *went* over.

- I could then have *gotten*.
- That have ever *sewn*.
- I have now *gone* over.

ERRORS.

CORRECTIONS.

4. You have *came* off.You have *come* off.5. In writing what I have *wrote*.In writing what I have *written*.

A constant repetition of the same error is proof of the highest order. I will only give a few specimens of each—out of scores that appear:—

2. *Proof that he does not know the first principles of concord.*

1. Whothen told the lie? *Me*,
or you, and Mr. Scott.—It was
you and *them*.

Who then told the lie? *I*, or
you and Mr. Scott. It was you
and *they*.

2. Before you and *him* came to
see me.

Before you and *he* came to see
me.

3. Every person who permits
you to baptize *them*.

Every person who permits
you to baptize *him*.

4. Any error, I would correct
them.

Any error, I would correct
it.

3. *Proof that he does not know the meaning of what he says—from his ignorance of some of the plainest principles of syntax.*

1. Which he does not, has not,
nor will *not* deny.

Here are three errors. Which
he does not deny, has not denied,
nor will deny. His last
phrase, "nor will not deny," just
means the reverse of what he
would wish to say—nor will not
deny, is equivalent to *he will*
deny.

2. This I did not do, nor never
dreamt of doing.

Here again he says what he
does not intend. He means,
"this I did not do, nor ever
dreamt of doing."

3. Myself, nor no other per-
son.

This is like the former.—My-
self, nor *any* other person.

4. And *he* you never saw.

And *him* you never saw.

I need not fill pages with these trifles. Let it be noted that I have only marked a few of those blunders which little boys and girls in every junior class, in every grammar school, are taught to correct before they begin to write composition. I have only noted these because of their convincing character. Were I to analyze his sentences on the principles of grammar, and according to all the rules of composition, I do not believe that five sentences of his own composition would stand the trial. Yet he has the *canny* to pronounce sentence of condem-

station upon the literary character of Mr. Scott's Reply, when he is, in his own writings, a sport to little girls!

He writes Latin too—O yes! quotes and translates as he goes. He appears not only a regenerated, but a learned "Regular" Divine. But, unfortunately, he does not quote with the understanding also. One of his wise and learned sentences runs thus, p. 15:—"Thusends the third falsehood, and you and W. Scott *reductio ad absurdum*, to say the best of you." I would advise him to insert *Barbara, celarent, Dario serioque*, in the midst of a sentence, when he means any thing terrible. When he means any thing sonorous and grand, let him add to the close, *Acacides, Agenorides, Jasidus, Priamides*. When he means to express his own terror and dismay, this beautiful line will answer every purpose, *Daphne, Helle, Helene, Cyrene*. If he makes a good use of these two lessons, his next pamphlet will appear not only correct, but elegant.

This gentleman sometime ago talked of other men's *canity*; but of all the vanity of vanities I have ever noticed, this deserves the palm. To see a man flourishing away in Latin quotations, gathered from dictionaries of quotations, put down at random, who cannot conjugate an English verb!!

Some of the illiterate will ask, How does this man "make out" to write a pamphlet. The secret I will now develope. He *steals* out of a few books all the high-sounding and fine-sounding words and phrases, and puts them together just as he thinks they will suit. Take a specimen, and a proof, if you will not take my word:—He has read Toplady's letter to John Wesley, and studied it pretty well. Toplady belabored John Wesley, and bedaubed him with many hard epithets and acrimonious expressions. Mr. Greatrake "took the notion" of becoming a great controversialist, and Toplady's style just suited the moral complexion of his mind. He either committed to memory Toplady's aspersions, or keeps that, and two other books of the same kind, at his elbow while he writes, and takes those phrases which he thinks will suit, and strings them together hap-hazard. Toplady, in his letter to J. Wesley, page 1st, calls him "the bell-wether of his deluded thousands" Mr. G. calls Mr. Scott, Mr. C's bell-

wether. Page 1d, Toplady says of "Wesley's redoubtable subalterns,"

"What image of their fury can we form?"

"Business and rage—a puddle in a storm."

Mr. G. bestows these two lines on Mr. Scott's pamphlet as a whole. Four lines after the above couplet, Toplady says of John Wesley's friends who defended him, that he would not notice them—for, says he,

"To shoot at crows is powder thrown away."

About the same number of lines distant from the above couplet, Mr. G. says, he will not notice Mr. Scott; for, "to shoot at crows is powder thrown away." This is Mr. Greatrake's method of making pamphlets, and strewing them through with fine expressions. So that in Mr. G's pamphlet—though it is Greatrake against Campbell, it is Toplady against John Wesley raised to life again. I will not tire my readers with any further notice of this man's *vanity* and *literary thefts*. But I request the reader to remember that this Mr. G. talks about *literature* and *vain men!!* So much in proof of Mr. G's ability to criticise Mr. Scott's productions in a literary way. I hope these notes will suffice as a good and lawful reason for my saying that Mr. G's *disposition, ignorance of scripture, and of the meaning of words and sentences*, peremptorily forbid me to pay any attention to, or to pass one reprehension on, his theological opinions.

Besides, his method of making quotations from my writings, and of putting those quotations together, would make it an endless task to detect and expose his flagrant injustice. He handles them thus:—In one place it is written, "Judas went and hanged himself;" and, in another passage, it is written, "Go thou and do likewise." Put these together, and the scriptures, says a caviller, commands men to hang themselves. In this way Mr. G. culls and collects scraps out of all connexion, and makes them speak what he pleases. I am ready, at all times, to defend whatever I have written, when any Christian, or gentleman, presents himself as a conscientious opponent.

CHAP. VII.

MR. G. calls my sentiments Sandemanianism. This is like him. In the last Association he lifted up his hand

to condemn a letter, and after he had voted it down as heterodox, when asked by a Baptist bishop if he had ever seen it, he declared he had not, but wished very much to see it. The bishop then asked him how he could vote the condemnation of a circular letter he had never seen nor heard. He replied, he had heard it said, that it was not sound!! He calls my sentiments Sandemanianism in the same way he condemned the above letter. For he never read the works of Sandeman. This I will prove just now. If he had read Sandeman, he would have been a much better orthographist than he is. And here, by the way, I would advise him, could I address him, to commit to memory the United States' Spelling Book, or some other work of the kind, before he writes his *third* pamphlet. For, in fact, his repeated misspelling of the same words, wherever he uses them, is intolerable in this advanced period of the world. His friend Toplady, I think, gave him a hint of this sort, which he ought to have remembered. But he represents my views of the Spirit, as Sandemanianism; and myself as teaching, that the faith of the gospel has nothing supernatural about it. This he calls Sandeman's opinion. Now we shall let him hear Sandeman speak a few words for the first time, in his life, he ever heard him. *Letters on Theon and Aspasio*, vol. 2, p. 124. "If we consider faith as appearing in the profession of it, we find the Apostles accounting the influence of the Holy Spirit necessary to enable a man to make such a profession of the faith as was to be admitted by Christians: No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Spirit.—There is no separating the agency of the Holy Spirit from the knowledge of the truth. To know the truth is life eternal, and this life is begun and supported by the Spirit of Christ." Now this makes Mr. G. the Sandemanian, and not me, according to his representation of my *views* and *his own*. Now had he read Sandeman, he never would have called me a Sandemanian,—except he would have done it, knowing that it was a reproach, when conscious that it applied to himself, and not to me, on his own hypothesis. I make no comments on these words of Sandeman—I bring them forward to prove what I proposed.

But, again, he calls me a *Sandemonian*, because he says that I teach that the reading of the scriptures will

always produce faith, or that a mere reading of the scriptures is all that is necessary to faith. This he calls Sandemanianism. And yet Sandeman says, vol. 2. p. 191, 4th ed. "Two men may be employed with equal diligence in studying the scripture, and with equal seriousness in praying for divine assistance; the one may come to know the truth, and the other may grope in the dark all his lifetime." This is another proof that Mr. G. on *his own hypothesis*, is a Sandemanian, though he did not know it!

Mr. G's sayings and insinuations about my receiving a challenge to debate with Mr. Walker, is precisely in character with his whole performance. He insinuates, page 17, that it was a *preconcerted thing* with Mr. Birch and myself to get up this debate. Although it is proved in the face of all his insinuations, that I never originated these debates, and he cannot deny the written documents already before the public; he now changes his mode of warfare, and would have the public believe that it was all a piece of artifice and a preconcerted scheme of mine, to gratify my vanity and avarice.— But Mr. G. supposes that Mr. Birch was a party in this hypocritical manœuvre. And, in fact, he makes every one who is not amongst his select band of *three* defamers, all fools or knaves, all hypocrites, impostors, liars, or slanderers. Such are Messrs. Church, T. Campbell, Rigdon, Scott, Mr. Birch, and myself. This charge against Mr. Birch and myself affords me another opportunity of adducing additional evidence of my former statements that it was with difficulty, great difficulty, my consent was gained to debate with Mr. Walker. Mr. Birch had *three* times solicited me to attend. He at last began to think that I would never accept the challenge. He had written me a letter a year or two before, which he supposed had offended me. To this he ascribed my long hesitancy. So far was it from being a matter of preconcert, that Mr. Birch and I had not been on terms of intimacy for a long time, as the following extract from his letter of March 27th, 1820, will shew:—

"I think sometimes I almost know your reason for not accepting the challenge, and for not sending me an answer. Perhaps you hardly know how to act towards a man from whom you first received a long letter of reproof, and perhaps something worse, and then to receive a letter from the same man, calling upon you

in the language of a brother, to come over and manage an argument in the bounds of his labors. I suppose you are waiting to see whether you can discover my motives for acting in this unaccountable manner. Therefore, dear brother, if I have wronged thee, or owe thee aught, place that to my account—I am willing to give thee satisfaction; but don't place it to the Lord's account, and refuse to come up to the help of Lord against the mighty. You will see by Mr. Walker's letter, that he is very confident, and intends it shall be a Spartan combat—death or victory. If nothing else will compel you to come, I trust the love of the truth will.

“JOHN BIRCH.

“Jefferson County, Ohio.”

The above demonstrates the baseness of Mr. G's insinuations and accusations about this affair.

Mr. G. in his implacable fury, next will have all my debates “mere compilations, a task which any school-boy with trifling attainments in language would have done as well.” Excellent critic! This is the first time I have to notice the character those works have obtained; and let it be noted it is not an occasion of my own seeking. I am compelled to it, and, therefore, it will not rank under the head of self-adulation. One hundred testimonies, and from Baptist ministers too, can be obtained, (indeed many have come here unsought and are now on-hand) equally flattering to that given below. Just the reverse of Mr. G's recommendation. I publish an extract from a letter lately received from an aged Baptist minister in the state of New York. This I do because it is the *last* one received, from a man I never saw, nor heard of, till I received his letter. He tells me he is 65 years old, a minister in the Black River Association. He writes as follows:—

I have been in the habit of reading all publications on the doctrine of baptism that have come my way for *forty years*. I have never found a piece that was, in my opinion, so full, so plain, so pertinent, so instructing, so convincing, so unanswerable, and unexceptionable, as yours against Mr. McCalla. And I thought it and felt it my duty to say to you—*Well done, good and faithful servant of the church of the Lord's Anointed.*

TIMOTHY BREWSTER.

Ellisburgh, Jefferson co. New York. }
Nov. 24th, 1824. }

Were it not irksome, I could give others equally as flattering, from many parts of the United States; but I wish to pass on with only what is necessary. This is enough to balance off the defamation of Mr. G. leaving

something in my favor. And it would be only a pompous display of a person's wealth, to pull out a thousand dollars to pay a debt of six and a fourth cents.

As there is no limit can be set to malicious insinuations, Mr. G. has only to go one step farther, and insinuate that all the documents I have adduced in this work to put down his calumnies, are forged. But as a preventative, by way of anticipation, I now inform the public that all the books and letters quoted are in my hands, open for the inspection of any gentleman who may please to inspect them:

Many things have not only been insinuated, but actually affirmed, by Mr. G. equally destitute of any fact to support them as those already noticed. To me it is painful, and, in my opinion, unnecessary to notice them all. Indeed I did not intend to specify so many as I have done. In justice to Mr. Rigdon, however, I feel myself constrained to particularize another instance, which I think I have already promised in this work. He wishes to give Mr. Rigdon the *lie* with a witness. First, says Mr. G. I can prove that Mr. Rigdon did say, at the store of Messrs. Eichbaum & Johnson, that "he thought and felt satisfied that I was the author before he came to see me." So he did, for I heard him say the same. Well, what of this? But the lie is here—that Mr. Rigdon should have said, when with me, in an interview with Mr. G. that "he thought that I was not the author, that I was too much of a gentleman and a Christian to write them." Now, whenever called upon, I will, in the most solemn manner declare—that Mr. Rigdon did, at the time alluded to, say no such thing; but that he said—"one thing he knew, that whosoever was the author of those letters, he was neither a gentleman nor a Christian." I was standing by his side when he made the above declaration; and the reason why I remember it so well, is, that I felt it, not having then read all the pamphlet, as rather too severe, upon the evidence I had, that Mr. G. was the author. I told it to other persons in Pittsburgh that same evening. Mr. G. also says in his book, that I told him that I considered him a Christian; whereas, in the presence of Messrs. Scott and Oburch, I told him that although he did not consider me a Christian, yet I proposed to be regulated by the laws

of Jesus Christ, and was then wishing to be regulated by those laws in coming to see him before I took any measures with a reference to his pamphlet. Indeed, the poor man seemed to be in such a mental perturbation at the time, that he did not appear to know what he said himself, much less to understand what others said to him.

CHAP. VIII.

HIS attack upon my father transcends, in its atrocity, all his other misdeeds. It finishes the climax of malevolent calumny. A single circumstance of his refusing to pray or give thanks at the house of Elder Phillips, because of his indisposition at the time in consequence of an oppressive cold, is made by Mr. G. a positive proof that the old man cordially hates prayer. For this he has arraigned him before the public, with less respect than is usually paid to a malefactor of the deepest guilt, when presented before the judgment seat. Moreover, this celebrated biographer, and miniature painter, professes to acquaint the public with his character, who has lived amongst that public for nearly eighteen years!! O yes! the acute and penetrating Mr. G. at a "bird's eye glance," can, in passing through a country, write the biography, and exhibit the character of any citizen he pleases. Prodigious genius! I think government ought to send him on a tour through all Europe, and in a few months we shall have the biography and miniature likeness, drawn to the life, of every personage in Europe we may wish to become acquainted with—especially if he is permitted to carry Toplady in his pocket. Indeed, I don't doubt but, by the assistance of Toplady, he might do it all before he starts!

But what raised his fury to such an effervescence against the old man? Why, Mr. Scott had published two certificates from the hand of Bishop David Phillips, and Ephraim Estep, Esq. in his "Reply," shewing that the aforesaid Lawrence Greatrake, a Regular Baptist regenerated Divine, had most vilely slandered Thomas Campbell, at the last Redstone Association. I will insert those certificates. Let them speak for themselves:—

CERTIFICATE OF MR. PHILIPS.

THE report that has been officiously spread to the prejudice of Mr. Thomas Campbell's Christian character, as through or from me, respecting his declining to pray or give thanks in my house, is entirely groundless, as to any offence on my part, taken up against him on that account, as if he had done so from principle of opposition to the duty or exercise of prayer. I never thought or said so; nor had I any just or obvious reason so to do. He, having upon all former occasions cheerfully and readily concurred with requests to lead in the worship of my family when he happened to be with us. Moreover, I verily believe, the reasons assigned by him to Ephraim Estep, to have been the true reasons of declining my invitation at that time; he being evidently weak, in consequence of a severe illness, out of which he was but recovering, and I at the same time exceedingly dull of hearing.

DAVID PHILIPS,

Pastor of the Church at Peters Creek.

CERTIFICATE OF MR. EPHRAIM ESTEP.

WHEREAS, it has been officiously reported, and, as appears, to the manifest injury of the Christian character of Mr. Thomas Campbell, that, when on a visit to Elder David Philips, last winter, he refused to pray or give thanks in his family; also, that in meeting with the church, or rather a few members of the church of Peters creek, upon that occasion (for a full meeting at that season was prevented by a deep and sudden fall of snow) he had uttered sentiments offensive to the church. I, who was one of three or four members only then present, and who also spent the evening with Mr. Campbell, at Pastor Philip's, declare as follows:—

That, on that occasion, nor on any other known to me, did Mr. Campbell utter sentiments offensive to said church. That he did utter sentiments in public, upon the said occasion, and upon the same subject, in conversation with myself in Pastor Philips', that were somewhat new to me, and of which I said so afterwards, I acknowledge; but that they were offensive to me or others, or to the truth, or that they were calculated to give offence to Christian ears, or that I ever said so, I utterly refuse and deny. That with respect to prayer, Mr. Campbell was asked by Father Philips to pray before going to bed, as is usual in his family, but declined it, and requested me to supply his place, is true; assigning as his reason for so doing, his personal weakness through indisposition, as not feeling able to speak sufficiently loud to be heard to the satisfaction or edification of Father Philips; upon which I consented to take his place at that time, is also true; but without any impeachment or surmise known to me, resting upon the mind of any present, that either then, or during such visit, he had declined taking part in the worship of God either from principle of objection or disapprobation, or of any other conceived aversion to the worship of God.

Given under my hand and seal, this 28th day of October, 1824.

EPHRAIM ESTEP.

These certificates throw the celebrated biographer into an unusual effervescence, which makes its appearance in every line he writes about the old man. No terms can be found too bad, no language too opprobrious, no aspersions too foul for him. His impudence, subtlety, and falsehood, are mere common-place terms in almost every sentence. Toplady's whole budget is poured about his ears. He flies to the "Recorder" with his triumvirate, and tells the people to take THAT for an earnest of what he will do when his next biography makes its appearance. He writes to David Philips, to try to draw from him something on which his creative powers might go to work to form some extenuation of his crime. But all will not do. He has to go to framing a certificate out of materials that will not cement. In fact he labors hard to give the lie to the venerable Philips. At one time he pities, at another flatters, at another time, in the same epistle, threatens the aged disciple; or, to use the language of Father Philips, "he strokes his head while he endeavors to cut his throat." Elder Philips writes to him at length. For Mr. G. had told him that he had cleared himself of the lie, and wished Elder Philips to take care of himself.

Now Mr. G. has conjured up from the letter he received from David Philips, something like a certificate contradicting the one already published in the name of the old man. In manufacturing this certificate from the letter of David Philips, Mr. G. has to insert, by way of cement, three parentheses and one note of his own; and thus the old man's letter is tortured, until it has to speak a language foreign to the intention of the writer. One would think, in reading Mr. G's statement of this matter, that the letter he had from David Philips was every way commendatory of his course. Yes, says he, p. 34, "having a letter to the point now before me from Elder Philips." And again, as if he wished to publish the whole letter, he says, p. 35, "I have not room to give the whole letter." Now one would think that the whole letter was just what every way pleased and suited Mr. G. But, strange to tell, it is all fable. Here follows a copy of the letter, with the exception of two or three lines at the close. It was taken from the original by David Philips' grandson, who, from some accidental

circumstance, omitted to transcribe the last two or three lines:—

PETERS CREEK, Nov. 11th, 1824.

Elder Lawrence Greentrake,

I HAVE received a letter from you, expressing an unexpressible surprize, grief, and sorrow, in seeing a certificate in print with my name affixed to it, for the purpose of making you a liar. Sir, I am equally surprized with you, at the relation your letter gives me, that you became under an imperious necessity of repairing to the Recorder's office to screen your own character from the odium of falsehood, and to lay it on my character. Sir, I take it very ungenerous of you. Now, sir, it is obvious to me, that whatever you have fabricated and put into the public newspaper, you intended, if attacked, to produce proof for, out of the simple, familiar, and unsuspecting relation I gave you of what took place at my house between Mr. Thomas Campbell and myself. Had I had the most distant suspicion that you would hoppas it to the Association, and then pack it back to Pittsburgh, and then hyke it away, or something drawn or inferred from it into the columns of the Recorder, I would have suppressed and kept it a secret from you in my own heart. Now, I ask you, sir, is all this under-handed work generous or gentleman-like? I was perfectly ignorant of your proceedings. It is all unauthorized by me, and unknowing to me, which I look upon to be exceeding unfair, which I will make appear before the face of an unbiassed, judging public, if I am constrained to it in vindication of my own character. You boast that you have cleared your character of the imputation of falsehood in the columns of the Recorder. If you have done it, sir, at the expense of my character, I, your neighbor and old stupid rustic, will come and search you out. But you have very great advantage of me—you have four cardinal witnesses and a host more lurking in ambush ready to prove—Prove what, sir; prove, I expect, that which I never did deny, nor ever will deny, unaltered in its shape or complexion, by the genius of a scientific manufacturer. Allow me, sir, to tell you that I am an old rustic; have lived in the world more than four-fifths of a century; filled several public situations in life, and supported an unblemished character. Until I contracted familiarity with you, I was always looked upon by many of the first characters among men in the world, as a man of truth, integrity and sincerity, and of real honesty.—I was not thought much of in Pittsburgh the time of your ordination, as I remember.

Now, sir, come with me and I will read in your hearing this phantomized certificate. You certainly never read it; or if you did, you could not understand it, because it is not in your current style. It is written in easy, smooth, Christian language, and in full consistency with scripture and truth; which says, "a soft answer turneth away wrath, but grievous words stir up anger." We are again taught by the Apostle that, if it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. This is the temper and spirit from which the certificate was wrote, which I expect was the cause why you did not understand it—Teaching you to read the certi-

Deate was the proposition I laid down. I am not going to abandon it now, sir. I will not transcribe the certificate. It is obvious from the face of the certificate that I charged Mr. Thomas Campbell with refusing to pray in my family, and also refusing to ask a blessing before we ate the food. His answer on each request was, "pray yourself," "ask a blessing yourself." Now would any man think it necessary to have all these words in form penned down to illustrate a fact. The fact was I asked Mr. Campbell to pray—he refused. I asked him to bless—he refused both, or either. But there is not a single clause in the certificate which I expect will be made to bear hard on my character. I said *I thought*. I said again in the certificate *I thought not*. I looked at the word *thought*—what does it amount to? It amounts to no more, in my simple opinion, than a ground of conjecture or surmise. Conjecture will prove nothing; therefore, I am obliged to believe Mr. Campbell denying that his refusal was from a principle of opposition to either of the two requests. I am no searcher of hearts. I never presumed to arrogate to myself one prerogative of the Divine perfections. One word more I shall add, and that is, if you or any of your host of witnesses should testify verbatim the words in your letter, I hold them guilty of falsehood. Take care how you treat my character as you go along.——I forbid you, sir, to make of me a vehicle of your slander any more.

DAVID PHILIPS.

Now, reader, I leave you to form your own opinions of the honesty, integrity, and truth of that man who could, or would, attempt to draw from this letter a certificate, in any way contrary to the one given above, in the name of, and signed by, David Philips; who could deliberately publish to the world that "he had a letter to the point before him from Elder Philips," and that "HE HAD NOT ROOM" TO GIVE THE WHOLE LETTER, implying his ardent wish to do so!!!

Who is safe in the hands of such a man, who, at a "bird's eye glance," can take likenesses, write memoirs, and draw characters to suit his interest or his inclination!

It appears a work of supererrogation to expose farther the iniquities of this pious clergyman in reference to the charges against Mr. Thomas Campbell. Was ever the like known, that a man who has never refused to pray in the presence of any man, or in the house of of any man who requested him, except in the case of indisposition; and especially in such an instance as that specified, should, on such grounds, be accused of "inveterate hostility to prayer"! And if I might be allowed to testify on the present occasion, I would most im-

partially and solemnly declare, that I know no man now living, who has, since the earliest period of my recollection, been so much engaged in prayer, public, social, private, as the accused; nor any man who has lived a more exemplary and godly life than he. To this I would add, that it is as universally known as he is known, that he has been as much in the habit of exhorting to the practice of prayer, as to any religious or moral duty whatsoever. But Mr. G. knows just as little of the man he accuses, as he does of that "text," "Fear not, little flock, it is the Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom," on which he lately preached a sermon—I mean that sermon which he delivered when he was soliciting contributions to pay for the *hire of the horse*, which carried himself and his pamphlets to market.

Any person who wishes to know the sentiments of Thomas Campbell on prayer, will find some instruction on this subject in all the essays over the signature of T. W. which have appeared in the 'Christian Baptist;' some of which were written before Mr. Greatrake "received ordination," or favored the West with any of his memoirs or miniature draughts. Also, he will find the very obnoxious sentiment which Mr. G. wishes to condemn, if he only reads an "Extract from my Sentimental Journal," published in the C. B. vol. p. 1. 259—263.—I will close this chapter by observing, that Joseph Philips, Esq. brother to Bishop David Philips, has authorized Mr. Thomas Campbell to state, if he thought it expedient so to do, that "Thomas Campbell lodged with him the next evening after he left his brother's house, where he had refused to pray from indisposition; and that, at the request of Joseph Philips, he made prayer in his family, without the semblance of hesitation, as he likewise had done upon every former occasion." To this I will add, that Bishop Philips authorized me to say, "that the conversation related by Mr. Greatrake, between him and Mr. T. Campbell, about going to prayer in his family, (in the 36th page of his late pamphlet,) never took place." His statement, therefore, of that matter is entirely false.

CHAP. IX.

I HAD intended to have recapitulated the items of slander, falsehood, vanity, literary theft, malevolence,

blunders, perversions, &c. &c. which I have detected, exposed, and refuted in the preceding pages; but I find the recapitulation and specification would be half as large as the whole of what I have written on the subject, and shall therefore abandon the idea with one observation, viz. that if *eight* small pages in the Christian Baptist required *twenty-five* large octavo pages from the pen of Mr. G. we may expect, according to the rule of three direct, that these *sixty* pages will require *one hundred and eighty-seven* large octavo pages of new and old columnies from the same pen. "*Crescit eundo*" will serve for a motto to Mr. G's next biography.

A few facts relative to this Mr. G. will, perhaps, be of some use to the public at a distance from Pittsburgh:

1st. It is a fact that he no longer stands in relation of a pastor to the little flock of "Regular Baptists" in Pittsburgh.

2d. It is a fact, that that same Bishop Rigdon, whom he reviles, was invited to the pulpit of the Regular Baptist church nearest to Pittsburgh since Mr. G. waged war against him, and that Mr. G. gave himself an invitation to "preach to the same church;" but was written to by its bishop not to come.

3d. It is a fact, that notwithstanding Mr. G. was requested to stay at home, he went to that same Baptist church; but that same regular Baptist church declined holding communion with him, for although it was "their communion season," they determined to postpone, rather than commune with him. Such is the standing of this Regular Baptist regenerated minister where best known. The above are facts, for the truth of which I stand pledged. So that this man has fallen by his own doings; but, as was said before, he had not any eminence to fall from, that threatened the breaking of his bones.

His pamphlets have been peculiarly acceptable to a few Paido-Baptists in this country, who have, I am well informed, been the most active agents in disseminating them. Some of them having graciously bought and bestowed them to any who would promise to read them. And I think it by no means improbable, (but that they would pay for the publication of a few more pamphlets of

the same sort. I will predict, however, that they will get tired ere one year rolls round, and that they cannot set this 'Regular Baptist' on his feet once more by all their efforts.

If the Apostle Paul, before the man of sin and son of perdition was exhibited, found it necessary to defend himself not only from the calumnies of the infidel Jews and interested Pagan priests, but also from the cavils and reproaches of those teachers of Christianity, who served not the Lord Jesus Christ, but their own bellies—we must not think it a *strange thing* that Christians, in this perilous age, should be sometimes called into the same painful circumstances—"Evil men and seducers, too, were to wax worse and worse." And Peter forwarned us that there should be false teachers amongst Christians, as there had been false prophets among the Jews. I sincerely deplore the existence of such a state of things amongst us as gives rise to such an ebullition of the worst passions of unsanctified men, under the mask of what is called "ministerial character." The very exposition of such evil passions places the defendant on the most forbidding ground. For although he were actuated by the most benevolent feelings, his expositions derive a sort of asperity and severity from the very nature of the things which he exhibits. Were he only to quote the very words of those who write in defence of their prettexts, without the fear of God before their eyes, the interspersion of their sayings, amongst the most mild and gentle remarks, would give an air of acrimony to the whole. I have endeavored, with the utmost vigilance, in writing these pages, to avoid every expression of harshness, every unbecoming epithet, in reference to the author of those calumnies. I could wish, with all my heart, that God would give him repentance to the acknowledgment of the truth. I do, indeed, consider that he has sinned most grievously against Heaven, and against the saints of the Most High God, independent of any offences he has committed against me. I do most deliberately say, weighing the import of every word, that I would not, for the wealth of the Indies, have reviled the disciples of the Lord Jesus as he has

reviled them in those two pamphlets.* Nor would I ap-

* Mr. G's slanders, published against the church of God in Pittsburgh, have no parallel in the annals of clerical slander which I have seen, except we should find it in his *form of prayer*, dictated to his adherents on my behalf. He even compares this church to the wh—e, mentioned Proverbs ix. 13—11; and in a foot note recommends the reader to turn over to this reference. The cause of this comparison, too, is, that this church is said to have bargained with Mr. Church that he should have the privilege of speaking at his baptism, and that he would join it when baptized. On this account, and because Mr. Scott, in his Reply, said that the church of Pittsburgh was standing "with the Bible and with open arms to receive every Christian," without the acknowledgment of any human tradition; I say, because of this, Mr. G. compares the church to the wh—e mentioned Prov. ix. 13. Yet the whole of this bargaining is a mere invention of Mr. G's own, as was shewn in Mr. S's Reply. And in fact, *application was made to me by Mr. Church for baptism, without any reference to the church in Pittsburgh.* The whole ground of this heinous comparison is of Mr. G's own making. He falsely accuses them of a certain error, and for this error falsely laid to their charge, compares them as above declared.

But how does Mr. G. account for these fables when exposed by Mr. Scott?—Why, he says, it was the common impression, the "town's talk." Suppose it was the common impression that the Allegheny mountain had sunk into a plain, because of a certain earthquake; would the man, who, on the grounds of common impressions, states it as a *fact*, be telling a truth or a lie?

But he excuses his mistakes or falsehoods about Mr. G's joining the church in Pittsburgh, by telling us that the order of a regular baptist church required his immediate addition to the church, and therefore he thought himself authorized in saying that he had joined this church on the ground of conjecture. But did not Mr. G. say before this, that they were not a regular Baptist church? How, then, could he guess at their practice from those whom he calls Regular Baptists!! But last of all, to help him out, and to bring his climax to a regular close, he quotes from Mr. Scott's Reply these words—"Mr Church did not agree with us—we agreed with him." On this Mr. G. comments with great spirit. Now, courteous reader, I know by this time you are so well acquainted with Mr. G. that you will not be startled when I tell you, that *there is no such a sentence in Mr. Scott's Reply.* It is a fabrication, or, perhaps you would call it a *forgery*, of Mr. G's. We dispense with all notes of admiration here. We have been so long in the attitude of admiration, that nothing Mr. G. can now say or do becomes admirable. The above fabrication has, with many things of the same kind in his last pamphlet, led me to suspect that the extract given us of a letter in the third page of his late pamphlet is a domestic fabrication—I say I suspect so, and, until I get the writer's name, I must think so. I am sure that Mr. G. can quote from his own brain, because he has done so already—and what he can do in sundry instances, he may do in others. This is like his telling us

pear in the presence of my Maker and my Judge as the author of those two pamphlets, (were my name cancelled in every line where it occurs, and that of any disciple of Christ inserted in lieu of it) for the universe, vast and magnificent as it is.

of many scores of dollars he has spent in preaching—But there is more than strong grounds for suspecting that he has not spent many. For how does the contract about the *bags*, and his now going round the country *begging* pay for what he calls the *hire of his horse* in distributing his pamphlets, comport with this generosity!—Besides, he has only been ordained a few months.

Mr. G. may acquit himself of all these misdeeds in the way that he has attempted to acquit himself on former occasions. When I repelled his *conjectural charge*, that I was actuated by some peculiar animity to that *denomination* from which I had separated—he retreats with great grace, by telling us that by *denomination* he meant “the Presbyterian church in all its distinction of Covenanters, Independents, and Seceders—and these I called a denomination.” This is something clever: a *Presbyterian independent!* Some people require a good memory. Mr. Church has, then, always been of one and the same *denomination*. In the same manner he justifies his calling that Philip, who baptized the eunuch, an Apostle. He says, he calls him an Apostle. Now, in this way, truth can be easily converted into falsehood, and falsehood into truth—virtues become vices, and *vice versa*.

But here, although I intended only to speak of his treatment of the saints in Pittsburgh, I am led on, by the association of ideas, to notice circumstances remotely connected therewith. I am accused by Mr. G. of having murdered the Regular Baptist church of Pittsburgh. This Regular Baptist Church has passed through singular fortunes. It has had six pastors: Messrs. Jones, Dodge, Newcomb, Davis, Rigdon and Greatrake. Messrs. Jones and Dodge were accused of drunkenness; Mr. Davis, of drunkenness, adultery, and lying; Mr. Newcomb, a godly man, of not having popularity enough to procure a *brick* meeting-house; Rigdon, of *heresy* for taking the Scriptures—that wicked book that goes to destroy vital piety, and which introduces a cold, speculative, and unfeeling religion, as some would seem to think. Mr. Greatrake has resigned already its pastoral care. Was I the cause of all this evil? Who said that Jones and Dodge were drunkards? That Davis was guilty of drunkenness, adultery, and lying? Who were excommunicated for *unlawy* conduct? Who compelled Mr. G. to resign? Let these questions be answered before I am accused and found guilty of murdering this church. I believe that the wheat has been pretty well purged in Pittsburgh. The disciples are now walking in peace and love. And Mr. G. and the *unlawy ones* were happily associated. What a pity that they got so soon tired of each other! Perhaps Mr. G. has, by this time, got into the folds or embraces of the Ansonda,

CHAP. X.

SELDOM have we heard of any clergyman, who, more unceremoniously, more frequently, and more positively told us that he was *regenerated*, than Mr. G. has done. No one has said more of the purity of his zeal, of the uprightness of his heart, of the disinterestedness of his efforts, than he has said in a few pages. If, then, a Regular Baptist *regenerated* minister can, consistently with his conscience, write in such a style, utter such hard sayings, resort to such means of slander, falsehood and detraction, present such petitions to Heaven, and exhibit such an unrelenting spirit of enmity, for the sake of making a breach in the reputation of those who stand in the way of his clerical projects; what is to be expected from those irregular, unbaptized, unregenerated ministers, who have their own projects to carry as well as he?

— Tremendous thought! The horrors of the inquisition, the terrors of a death mingled not with one drop of mercy, rise to my view, in colors too vivid to be expressed. Pardon me while I say, that I think the cruelties of highwaymen and pirates would be tender mercies in comparison of theirs.

If my sentiments be erroneous, unscriptural, or dangerous to society, is there no other way of opposing them, than by false accusations, vulgar aspersions, horrific imprecations and curses! Is there no rational, moral, nor religious way of refuting them! Is there no gentlemanly way of doing it! Must my opponents for ever deal in the tropes and figures of the veriest blackguards!!

Mr. G. indeed, says that it is an axiom amongst Christians, "*though a man gives no evidence that he is an unregenerated man, still there may be entire destitution of evidence that he is regenerated.*" "There," adds he, puzzle your brain with that position, scan it to the best of your ability; and you will, in so doing, furnish additional evidence that you have no spiritual perceptions." "Had you ever been taught in the school of Christ, you would have known what this axiom means." This is a hard case, indeed! Terrible brow-beating. I am stupefied with such blows. Why insult me thus? If I am

unregenerated, according to him, it is my *misfortune*, not my *crime*. Ask him, Can a man regenerate himself; and he will tell you, no. Why then browbeat him, and boast and triumph over him, because *unregenerate*? What has Mr. G. that he has not received, and by "*special-grace*" too; and if he have received it, why does he boast as though he had not received it? Or, does he think that a man can, in whole, or in part, regenerate himself? If he can, then it is his *crime*; if he cannot, then it is his *misfortune* to be *unregenerate*.

But, again, why submit to me such "*an axiom*," accompanied with such conditions? If "*I scan it*," in so doing, I will only furnish additional evidence that I have "*no spiritual perceptions*." For none but a man who has spiritual perceptions can understand it. It is intelligible only to the regenerate. Those "*in the school of Christ are taught*," but those, like me, out of it, are not taught such positions. Why puzzle me with it, seeing, when I have done my best, I must only prove that I have "*no spiritual perceptions*"? Kind and benevolent, humble and condescending are the regenerate!

I will, however, try the axiom. Before I attempt it I am told that I have no spiritual perceptions—it can be no worse when I have done. I can only hear it again, with, perhaps, an additional curse.

Professors of christianity are the persons in dispute. The axiom stands thus—"Though a man, professing christianity, gives no evidence that he is an unregenerated man;" that is, does every thing that regenerated persons do—then, I ask, what "*destitution of evidence* can there be that he is regenerated." For if he gives no evidence that he is unregenerated, then he gives all the evidence that any man can give that he is regenerated. A man that gives no evidence, in word or deed, that he is a thief—gives every evidence in his power that he is an honest man. If a man leave any thing undone, that the regenerate do, or do any thing that they do not, then he ceases to be the subject of his proposition,—then he ceases to be the professor that gives no evidence that he is unregenerate. So that his axiom is no axiom at all, but a perfect absurdity. But then I was "*not taught it in the school of Christ*," nor have I any "*spiritual perceptions*." I have judged as a *natural man* according

to the *letter* of the axiom. Mr. G. who was taught in the school of Christ, and who has got the most acute spiritual perceptions, understands it in its spiritual import. When vowels and consonants present themselves to the eyes of such spiritual men, they communicate ideas to them quite different from, and often quite contrary to, those they convey to the unregenerated. It would not be amiss for Mr. G. to consult some dictionary on the word *axiom*, as I have no doubt but he will, before he next write.

Now I say, that the sooner the Baptist society, and the Christian community at large, get rid of all such regenerated teachers, the better for them, and the better for the world. I would not urge, however, that they should pray for the restraining grace to be taken off, but rather that it might be more copiously bestowed upon them; for this would be not only worse for me and themselves, but also for the world—nay, pray that God may restrain them more and more. I urge the necessity of their being *restrained*. And were it not for the restraining power of our happy constitution upon such regenerated ones, we, whom they call the unregenerate, would be all restrained from writing and speaking by prison walls, and iron chains, in a very short space.

If I could persuade myself that the present state of things in the christian community was the legitimate issue of the religion of the New Testament, I would steer my course down the stream of time with wind and tide, in full company with all the fleet. But I cannot think, by any interpretation that can be put upon the oracles of God, that things are as *they once were*—or as *they ought to be*. I am persuaded that the Christian religion is from Heaven. Every thing in it is godlike and divine. It is worthy of its author; and every way adapted to man as he exists. Through the corruption of men, and especially of those who have professed to be the teachers of it, “the fine gold has become dim,” and the cup of bliss, presented to the *lips* of mortals by the Father of our spirits, has been mingled with wormwood and gall by most of those who profess to be employed to put it into their *hands*.

I at once acknowledge that I believe that the Baptist society has apostatized as well as other societies, and

that it loudly calls for a *restoration* of the *ancient order* of things. The members of that community are defective in knowledge, faith, hope and charity, as well as other Christians. The fruits of the Holy Spirit are not conspicuous in the lives of the majority of professors under any name. A religion without purity of heart, without peace and joy in the Holy Spirit, without the sure and certain hope of immortality, without a righteous and benevolent deportment, is not worth the name. An intelligent mind, an honest heart, and a virtuous life, are not only intimately connected, and mutually dependent on each other, but essential to a good and happy man. The design of the Christian Revelation is to make men wise, virtuous, and happy; and whatever has not this tendency, is no part of the system. If, then, there be any thing in the views which I exhibit, in the course which I recommend, that has not this tendency, I defend it not. The popular religion is either a religion of ceremonies and forms, a stupid superstition, a romantic enthusiasm, or a compound of all, cemented by a false and vain philosophy, a crude, unfathomable, and inexplicable jargon of inconclusive and inoperative metaphysics. Christians in the various sects are bewildered in the mists of this religious philosophy, and in the mazes of a devout intricacy, the awful result of a substitution of phantacies for revelation, of mysterious speculations for express declaration, and of human decrees for the commandments of God. So long as the present method of teaching christianity is admired, and creeds, formed by metaphysical theologians, subscribed to; so long as the fashionable preachers, with their haughty and vain assumptions that the Holy Spirit accompanies *their* ministrations and inspires them with new messages,* are looked up to, so long will the people be as they now are—ignorant of the scriptures, zealous for trifles, filled with delusion, wrath and envy, either

* Mr. G. is so full of the notion of the Spirit of God accompanying him since he was ordained, (though with some difficulty it was accomplished,) that he even thinks it will accompany his very calumnies and slanders, and, therefore, concludes his first pamphlet of slander with these words, "*Spirit of Jehovah NOW do thine office!*" For I have done my duty—it therefore becomes you to ~~come~~ after ME. I, the first—you, the second.

lukewarm or fanatical, destitute of the spirit of goodness, having a *form*, and often scarcely the form, of godliness, but denying the power thereof. Is not this true of the great mass of professors of the present day?

The Christian Baptist is intended as a means to call men off from these vanities to *the Bible* and *the throne of Grace*. Some of the clergy hate it as they do the loss of wealth and fame. But, however it may be viewed through the various media of a hundred systems and every human passion, I can appeal to Heaven that the motives and inducements which ushered it into existence were benevolent and philanthropic, and the community where it is read and known can all bear witness, that no man has yet appeared as a rational, moral, or religious opponent, that can refute, in the presence of the Bible, and before the face of the public, enlightened only as it is on these topics, one position which it has presented to the public. I have invited their open, manly, rational, and scriptural investigation; I have promised to publish their pieces on its pages. But what has been done? The public need not be informed. Their imprecations and their curses, their reproaches and their calumnies, their perversions and misrepresentations, are before us, and constitute all that they can do in support of themselves and in opposition to us.

—:0:—

☞ A large variety of documents have this day been received; amongst which are other certificates attesting facts already stated with a reference to Mr. Greatrake and his pamphlets. We are sorry that they arrived too late for insertion in this work. Both the size of this pamphlet, and the greater importance of other concerns, pressing upon us, admonish us to bring it to a close, and forbid their insertion. Besides, it is not our custom to exhaust any subject; nor to quit the chase with an empty quiver.

January 17, 1824.

Since the above was in type, we discover that there is room for the insertion of more matter to complete the form. We, therefore, insert the two following certificates, which will serve as additional evidence of the truth of our former statements, and of the "moral complexion" of Mr. G's mind—who represented me as having slandered the party over which Mr. G. was once pastor, for declaring that they were an excluded party from a Regular Baptist church at least a church so reputed at the time of their separation.

THIS IS TO CERTIFY, That in the spring of 1823, there was but one society in Pittsburgh, professing and acknowledged to be a "Regular Baptist Church;" which society met in the meeting-house, on the corner of Grant and Third streets—That, before the meeting of the Association in this city, the above mentioned society did exclude about fourteen or fifteen of its members, and retained its former place of meeting—That the "Association," met in this house and received a letter from the society in whose house they were convened—which denominated them the "First Baptist Church in Pittsburgh—That I heard the Rev. Mr. Estep desire the "messengers" of this church to defer taking their seats at present, acknowledging at the same time, "*it was their right,*" and he asked it only as a "*favor.*" *And I do further testify,* That I have heard two or three of those same persons more than once acknowledge that they were excommunicated from the society above alluded to.

JOHN C. ASHLEY.

I can testify, That I have heard certain of the above mentioned persons admit they were excluded by Mr. Rigdon and the other brethren.

B. PYATT.

THE English Baptists who published a confession of their faith in 1646, to put down the slanders of the Paidobaptists, thus declare:—

“ We desire to live quietly and peaceably, as becomes saints, endeavoring in all things to keep a good conscience, and to do to every man (of what judgment soever) as we would they should do to us; that as our practice is, so it may prove us to be a conscionable, quiet, and harmless people, (no way dangerous or troublesome to human society) and to labor to work with our own hands, that we may not be chargeable to any, but to give to him that needeth, both friend and enemy, accounting it more excellent to give than to receive. Also we confess, that we know but in part, to shew us from the word of God, that which we see not, we shall have cause to be thankful to God and them. But if any man shall impose upon us any thing that we see not to be commanded by our Lord Jesus Christ, we should, in his strength, rather embrace all reproaches, and tortures of men; to be stripped of all our outward comforts, and if it were possible, to die a thousand deaths, rather than to do any thing against the light of our own consciences. And if any shall call what we have said heresy, then we do with the apostle acknowledge, that after the way they call heresy, so worship we the God of our fathers; disclaiming all heresies (rightly so called) because they are against Christ; and desiring to be steadfast and immovable, always abounding in obedience to Christ, as knowing our labor shall not be in vain in the Lord.”

[Mr. G's opposition to us recalled this declaration to our recollection. The spirit which it breathes cannot be too much admired.]

Dr. Featly reviles them as Mr. G. reviles us:—

“ Presuming upon the patience of the state, they have rebaptized one hundred men and women together, in the twilight, in rivulets, and some arms of the Thames, and elsewhere, dipping them over head and ears. They have printed divers pamphlets in defence of their heresy, and challenged some of our preachers to a disputation.”

[What impudent, vain, and avaricious mortals they were ! !]

The Rev Mr. Baxter reviled the Baptists about their opposition to the clergy, as Mr. G. reviles me:—

"There were but few of them who had not been the opposers and troublers of faithful ministers—That in this they strengthened the hands of the profane, and that in general, *reproach of ministers, faction, pride, and scandalous practices were fomented in their way.*"

The only thing that I know of in the annals of the world, that comes any way near to Mr. G's form of prayer, and malevolence, (and this falls far short) is the conduct of some of the clergy of England to Mr. Hanserd Knollys, a Baptist bishop. His own letter gives an epitome of it:—

TO MR. DUTTON.

Beloved Brother—I salute you in the Lord. Your letter I received the last day of the week; and upon the first day I did salute the brethren in your name, who re-salute you and pray for you. The city presbyterians have sent a letter to the synod, dated from Sion College, against any *toleration*; and they are fasting and praying at Sion college this day, about further contrivings against God's poor innocent ones; but God will doubtless answer them according to the idol of their own hearts. To-morrow there is a fast kept by both houses, and the synod at Westminster. They say it is to seek God about the establishing of worship according to their covenant. They have *first vowed, now they make enquiry*. God will certainly "take the crafty in their own snare, and make the wisdom of the wise foolishness;" for "he chooseth the foolish things of this world to confound the wise, and weak things to confound the mighty." My wife and family remember their love to you. Salute the brethren that are with you. Farewell.

Your brother in the faith and fellowship of the gospel.
HANSERD KNOLLYS.

London, the 13th of the 11th month called January, 1645.

ERRATUM.—In some copies, page 35, 6th line from the bottom, before *know* read *not*.